DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 439 UD 028 797

AUTHOR Strang, E. William; Carlson, Elaine
TITLE Providing Chapter 1 Services to Limited English-Proficient Students. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Policy and Planning (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 91
CONTRACT LC89089001
NOTE 194p.
AVAILABLE FROM U.S. Department of Education, Office of Policy and Planning, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3127, Washington, DC 20202 (free).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; Case Studies; *Compensatory Education; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Equal Education; Federal Programs; *Homeless People; *Limited English Speaking; Public Education; *School Districts; Secondary School Students; Special Needs Students; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Hawkins Stafford Act 1988; Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This report describes local procedures for implementing Chapter 1 requirements for selecting limited English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1 programs, and describes services for LEP students through Chapter 1 and language programs. Case studies of 14 school districts in 6 states were conducted to help the Department of Education formulate appropriate guidance for school districts in providing Chapter 1 services to LEP students. This report outlines these case studies, and provides the overall study's background, conclusions, and recommendations. Several districts consider students with low scores on English-language proficiency tests as ineligible for Chapter 1 reading and mathematics services and do not assess them for Chapter 1. English-language proficiency tests are used to select students for Chapter 1 funded English as a second language classes in most districts. Teacher judgments are used more often to select LEP students than English-proficient ones for Chapter 1. Coordination between Chapter 1 and language services for LEP students is rare at the state level. The degree to which LEP students are included in Chapter 1 is related to the design of local Chapter 1 and special language programs and district personnel's perspectives about how LEP students' educational experiences should be structured. LEP students can be better served by Chapter 1 programs if schools improve coordination between Chapter 1 and other programs. Statistical data are provided in 14 tables. Appendix A provides the 14 case reports. Appendix B presents 16 questionnaires and checklists administered to Chapter 1 program administrators, schools, teachers, and counselors. (RLC)

ED348439

PROVIDING CHAPTER 1 SERVICES TO LIMITED ENGLISH-PROFICIENT STUDENTS

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD028797

Prepared under contract for
the Department of Education by:

WESTAT, INC.
Rockville, Maryland
Contract No. LC89089001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION • OFFICE OF POLICY AND PLANNING

PROVIDING CHAPTER 1 SERVICES TO LIMITED ENGLISH-PROFICIENT STUDENTS

FINAL REPORT

1991

E. William Strang
Elaine Carlson

Submitted to:

Office of Policy and Planning
U.S. Department of Education

By Westat, Inc.

This study was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, under Contract No. LC 89089001, Task No. LC 900120. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	iii
Chapter 1. Background	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Background and Scope of the Issues	2
Study Methods and Study Questions	3
Organization of this Report	7
Chapter 2. Identification and Selection of LEP Students for Chapter 1	9
Identifying Students as Limited English Proficient	9
Procedures for Selecting LEP Students for Chapter 1	15
Factors Affecting Local Policies and Procedures for Selecting LEP Students for Chapter 1	29
Adequacy of Chapter 1 Selection Procedures for LEP Students	36
Chapter 3. Instructional Services for LEP Students Provided by Chapter 1 and Language Programs	43
Characteristics of Chapter 1 Services for LEP and English-Proficient Students	43
Availability and Characteristics of Non-Chapter 1 Language Services for LEP Students	47
Relationships Between Chapter 1 and Language Services for LEP Students	53
Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations	59
Summary of Major Observations	59
Additional Issues and Concerns	62
Recommendations	65
Appendix A. Case Study Reports	A-1
Appendix B. Case Study Protocol	B-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	Study Questions for Case Studies of the Provision of Chapter 1 Services for LEP Students	4
Table 1.2	Characteristics of Selected States and Districts	6
Table 2.1	SEA and District-level Policies for Identifying LEP Students	11
Table 2.2	Tests Used to Identify LEP Students	14
Table 2.3	Prior Conditions to be Met by LEP Students for Selection into Chapter 1	20
Table 2.4	Achievement Tests for Chapter 1 Selection	22
Table 2.5	Criterion-Referenced Tests for Chapter 1 Selection, by District	25
Table 2.6	Use of Teacher Judgments for Chapter 1 Selection	26
Table 2.7	Philosophies and Models for Serving LEP Students in Chapter 1 by State and District	33
Table 2.8	Adequacy of Districts' Procedures for Selecting LEP Students Into Chapter 1	38
Table 3.1	Chapter 1 Services for LEP and English-Proficient Students	44
Table 3.2	Language Services for LEP Students	49
Table 4.1	Data Elements for a Composite Measure to Assess the Educational Needs of LEP Students	69
Table A.1	Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in the Case Study Reports	A-4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

This study had two purposes. First, it was to describe local procedures for implementing the requirements of Chapter 1 regarding selection of limited English-proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1. Second, it was to describe the types of services provided to LEP students through Chapter 1. Case studies of 14 school districts in six states were conducted to assist the U.S. Department of Education in formulating appropriate guidance for school districts in providing Chapter 1 services to LEP students.

SELECTING LEP STUDENTS FOR CHAPTER 1

Several districts consider students with low scores on English-language proficiency tests to be ineligible for Chapter 1 reading and math services and therefore do not assess them for Chapter 1. Other districts select LEP students for those Chapter 1 services differently than English-proficient students, and they make their decisions on which procedures or measures to use for Chapter 1 selection on the results of English-language proficiency tests.

English-language proficiency tests are used to select students for Chapter 1-funded English as a second language (ESL) classes in most districts offering that service.

Standardized achievement tests in math and reading are used to select English-proficient and some LEP students for Chapter 1 in almost every district. Primary-language (non-English) achievement tests are used to select Spanish-speaking students for Chapter 1 in a few districts. No standardized achievement tests in languages other than English or Spanish are used.

Teacher judgments are used more frequently to select LEP students than English-proficient ones for Chapter 1. In some cases, teachers judge whether LEP students are capable of taking an English-language achievement test, and, in other cases, teacher judgment is sufficient to select a student when no primary-language achievement test is available.

STATE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Few of the visited states make more than modest efforts to inform their districts that LEP students may be served in Chapter 1. Coordination between Chapter 1 and language services for LEP students is rare at the state level; the two programs exist separately with different histories and agendas.

DESIGN OF LOCAL CHAPTER 1 AND SPECIAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

The degree to which LEP students are included in Chapter 1 is closely related to the design of local Chapter 1 and special language programs. The perspective of district personnel about how to structure the educational experiences of LEP students is particularly important. One perspective is that English proficiency must be attained before other needs can be diagnosed and addressed properly. A second perspective holds that needs for compensatory education can be diagnosed and addressed regardless of English proficiency.

Districts usually fit into one of two models for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 that parallel these two perspectives:

- LEP students in *sequentially ordered services* districts need to reach a prescribed level of English language proficiency before being assessed for Chapter 1. Once that prescribed level has been reached, LEP students are assessed, selected, and served in the same way as English proficient students.

- LEP students in *simultaneous services* districts are eligible to receive Chapter 1 services and language services for LEP students simultaneously. Primary-language achievement tests are used to determine the eligibility of (at least Spanish-speaking) LEP students for Chapter 1.

ADEQUACY OF CHAPTER 1 SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR LEP STUDENTS

Three criteria of adequacy were applied to the Chapter 1 selection procedures for LEP students:

- whether the procedures can distinguish between lack of English-language proficiency and educational deprivation;

- whether the procedures are comparable to the extent they lead to the selection of English proficient and LEP students for Chapter 1 services who have similar needs; and

- whether the procedures result in the selection of roughly proportional numbers of LEP and English-proficient students into Chapter 1.

Based on these criteria, the procedures used in all the districts fall short, but the districts using primary-language testing generally meet more of the criteria than other districts.

CHAPTER 1 SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS

Sequentially ordered services districts provide Chapter 1 services only to some of the potentially eligible LEP students. Although reading, math, and language arts services are generally provided in those districts for English-proficient students, LEP students are not eligible for that support while they have low levels of English-language skills; however, some of those students may receive Chapter 1-funded ESL. To reach the level of English-language proficiency required to enter Chapter 1 may take several years; thus, they may be at a grade where Chapter 1 academic services are no longer provided when that level is attained.

Further, in some of these sequentially ordered services districts, students must also demonstrate a high level of English reading achievement to exit LEP services. This level may actually be above the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off, so these students may never be able to qualify for Chapter 1 services.

In the simultaneous services districts, Chapter 1-eligible LEP students generally receive the same Chapter 1 services as their English-proficient peers, but in their primary language.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Guidance provided to districts should specifically note that Chapter 1 can provide ESL services, but those services must be clearly supplementary to ESL services funded by other sources.

- Districts that use Chapter 1 funds to supplement other ESL instruction must justify that they select LEP students for Chapter 1 ESL services based on educational needs that are in addition to lack of English-language proficiency.

- The U.S. Department of Education should encourage development of native language assessment instruments to determine language-independent basic skills proficiencies.

- Local Chapter 1 administrators should be required to provide assurances in their applications that service patterns and models have been designed in coordination with administrators from language services programs.

- State Chapter 1 directors should be required to provide assurances that (1) requirements for serving LEP students are disseminated to local projects, (2) monitoring procedures include appropriate provisions to assess whether the requirements are being met, and (3) the state office is prepared to assist districts that have difficulty meeting the requirements.

- Chapter 1 personnel should systematically use data from sources such as education histories, informal assessments, and classroom performance to select LEP students for Chapter 1 until the inadequacies of achievement tests for these students are rectified.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND

Purpose of the Study

Providing Chapter 1 services to limited English proficient (LEP) students poses two sets of problems for local educators. The first concerns selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 and is a result of the Chapter 1 requirement that "[c]hildren receiving services to overcome ... limited English proficiency shall ... be eligible to receive [Chapter 1] services under this part, if they have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not related solely to ... limited English proficiency" (Section 1014 (d)(1) P.L. 100-297). Educational deprivation is defined as being below the level of educational attainment appropriate for children of a given age. Children, under this definition, may be educationally deprived for many different reasons. The dilemma posed to educators by this requirement is deciding whether a particular child's low test score or other indicator of educational deprivation results from limited English proficiency or is due to some other cause, such as limited schooling. If limited English proficiency is the only cause of low academic achievement, then the child would not be eligible for Chapter 1 services, but separating out the effects of language background from other sources of low educational performance can be difficult.

The second set of problems concerns what services can be provided to LEP students through Chapter 1. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (as interpreted by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) following *Lau v. Nichols*) assigns districts the responsibility of addressing the language-related needs of LEP students. This means that Chapter 1 services must be appropriate to meet the needs of students resulting from their educational deprivation and must be supplemental to the local services required under Title VI that are designed to meet language needs: "An LEA may not use [Chapter 1]

funds available under this part to provide services that are required by Federal, State, or local law to overcome ... children's limited English proficiency" (200.31(c)(5)(iii)).

Parallel to those two sets of problems, the purposes of this study also were twofold. The first purpose was to examine local alternatives for implementing the requirements of Chapter 1 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments of 1988 (P.L. 100-297), and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 regarding selection of limited English proficient (LEP) students for Chapter 1. Second, it was to describe the types of services LEP students receive from Chapter 1.

Background and Scope of the Issues

A review of the research literature produced four key conclusions:

- LEP students, as a group, are more likely than their English-proficient peers to be educationally deprived.
- Estimates of the number and characteristics of LEP students are imprecise because states and districts do not use the same definitions of English proficiency, and the definitions are not used uniformly even within districts.
- Nearly half of the Chapter 1 districts with LEP students appear to make distinctions between LEP and other students in their Chapter 1 selection policies.
- Districts' Chapter 1 student selection policies related to LEP students are not necessarily implemented faithfully at the school level.

In addition to those specific findings, the most noteworthy finding of the review was how little was known about services to LEP students under Chapter 1.

Providing Chapter 1 services to LEP students is of increasing importance. An estimated 1.74 million LEP students were enrolled in public and private schools according to the 1991 Condition of Bilingual Education. Growth in the size of the LEP population poses a particular problem for

Chapter 1 since LEP students, as a group, are more likely than their English-proficient peers to live in poorer neighborhoods than English-proficient students, at least on average, and poorer neighborhoods are more likely to be served by schools with Chapter 1 programs.

Study Methods and Study Questions

We conducted case studies of 14 districts in six states to collect information to answer two central questions:

- What procedures and criteria are used at the district and school levels to select LEP and English-proficient students for Chapter 1?
- What educational services does Chapter 1 provide to LEP students?

These two questions generated the list of specific study questions outlined in table 1.1.

Instrumentation

Respondents were identified for each study question, and items were drafted that were designed to take into consideration the role of the respondent and the information requirements of the study question. Because in-person interviews were planned for most respondents, careful attention was given to developing a full range of probes and follow-up questions. In addition to the survey instruments, checklists were developed to collect and review documentation at the SEA and district levels, and forms were prepared for recording the demographic and program characteristics of the visited LEAs and schools. Copies of the instruments are in Appendix B.

Site Selection Procedures

The reviews undertaken in the preparation of the study design suggested that programmatically significant differences in the policies and procedures related to serving LEP students in Chapter 1 can be found across SEAs, across districts within a state, and across schools within a district.

Table 1.1

Study Questions for Case Studies of the Provision of Chapter 1 Services for LEP Students

I. What procedures and criteria are used at the district and school levels to select LEP and English-proficient students for Chapter 1?

- A. What role do standardized achievement tests, English language proficiency tests, native language achievement tests, and teacher judgments play in the selection of LEP and English-proficient students for Chapter 1?
- B. Can the procedures districts use to select LEP students for Chapter 1 distinguish between educational deprivation and limited English proficiency?
- C. On what bases do district and school policies for selecting LEP and English-proficient students for Chapter 1 vary?
- D. Are variations in definitions of limited English proficiency related to district and school policies and procedures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1?
- E. How do school-level procedures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 relate to district policies?

II. What educational services does Chapter 1 provide to LEP students?

- A. How do districts assess the compensatory education needs of LEP students? How do districts determine which eligible LEP students receive Chapter 1 ESL? Chapter 1 reading? Other? What is the burden associated with these procedures?
- B. What services does Chapter 1 provide to LEP students to meet local objectives in reading and mathematics?
- C. What language-related services do districts provide to LEP students using funds from sources other than Chapter 1?

States. Six states were selected to capture variation in the percentage of LEP students in the population, in SEA activity levels related to educational services for LEP students, and in geographic region. Each state's activity level was ranked using criteria developed for a previous ED-sponsored study of services to LEP students.[1] Two of the six states were among the most active, three were moderately active, and one was among the low-activity states. The states in this study had percentages of LEP students ranging from less than 1 percent to nearly 9 percent, and the six states together enrolled about 45 percent of the nation's LEP students.

School Districts. A minimum of two districts was selected from each state, with the total district sample of 14 selected purposefully to reflect diversity in the proportion of elementary students who are LEP and the size of the district's elementary school enrollment. To the extent those criteria were met, districts were selected that included multiple language groups or innovative Chapter 1 or LEP programs. SEA personnel nominated districts based on the aforementioned criteria; the nominees were then contacted to confirm information about their programs and the characteristics of their students. Table 1.2 includes descriptive information about each of the selected districts. More information about each district is provided in the case study reports in Appendix A.

Schools. All selected schools were public, enrolled LEP students, and had at least four consecutive grade levels within the K-6 range. In consultation with district personnel, we selected three schools in most districts to provide examples of (1) Chapter 1 selection practices for LEP students that were common to most schools in the district and (2) special programming for LEP students.

---

[1]Young, Malcolm, et al. (1984). LEP students: Characteristics and school services--The descriptive phase report of the national longitudinal evaluation of the effectiveness of services for language-minority, limited English proficient students. Development Associates. Arlington, VA: (author). To determine activity levels, points were awarded for six characteristics, including: Title VII Training Funds; Title VII SEA Program; Transition Program for Refugee Children; State Funds for LEP Students; State Certification Policy; and State Legislation.

Table 1.2

Characteristics of Selected States and Districts

District	State Activity	State Percent LEP	Region	District Enrollment	District Percent Students in Chapter 1	District Percent Students LEP	Multiple Languages	District Percent LEP Students in Chapter 1
A1	Moderate	9	West	22,476	34	12	Yes	NA
A2	Moderate	9	West	116,000	30	19	Yes	28%*1
A3	Moderate	9	West	28,600	16	19	Yes	NA
B1	Moderate	3	South	151,976	7	4	No	*2
B2	Moderate	3	South	16,500	5	2	No	0%
C1	Active	3	Central	417,000	16	10	Yes	NA
C2	Active	1	Central	5,090	9	4	Yes	0%*3
C3	Active	1	Central	2,806	2	25	Yes	0%*4
D1	Active	1	Central	6,451	7	2	Yes	>16%*5
D2	Active	1	Central	35,676	17	11	Yes	NA
E1	Inactive	1	East	14,976	21	5	No	NA
E2	Inactive	1	East	13,012	15	7	No	NA
F1	Moderate	2	West	43,654	8	6	Yes	NA
F2	Moderate	2	West	12,168	11	14	No	NA

*1 Teachers estimate that 90-95 percent of LEP students in grades served by Chapter 1 participate in Chapter 1.
*2 Teachers report that almost all LEP students in grades 1-5 are served in Chapter 1.
*3 At the time of the site visit four LEP students were being served in Chapter 1.
*4 At the time of the site visit five LEP students were being served in Chapter 1.
*5 In the three visited schools, 14 of 37 LEP students were served in Chapter 1. Percentage assumes none of LEP students in other schools are served in Chapter 1 and therefore should be interpreted as a lower bound.

In addition, some schools were selected to represent variations in the proportion of LEP students in the school and the size of the student body. A total of 42 schools was selected and visited.

Individual Respondents. At the SEA level, we conducted telephone interviews with the Chapter 1 director and the administrator responsible for language programs for elementary LEP students.

At the district level, we conducted in-person interviews with the administrators responsible for language services for public elementary LEP students and the district's Chapter 1 program. If there was an administrator of federal or categorical programs who oversaw both Chapter 1 and programs for LEP students, that person was also interviewed.

Among school personnel, information was collected through interviews with the principal and the following individuals where available: school-level Chapter 1 coordinator, school-level administrator of services for LEP students, Chapter 1 teacher/aide, counselor, LEP teacher/aide, and regular classroom teacher.

Site Visit Procedures

Telephone interviews with SEA-level Chapter 1 coordinators and bilingual/ESL coordinators were completed prior to on-site data collection in the districts and schools. In addition, all site visitors participated in a two-day training session before the visits. The site visits generally were conducted by one person, with each visit lasting about four days. While on site, staff conducted interviews, gathered and reviewed documents, and observed Chapter 1 and language services for LEP students.

Organization of this Report

Chapter 2 describes how districts identify students as limited English proficient and, in turn, how some of these students are selected for Chapter 1. In Chapter 3, instructional services for LEP

students provided by Chapter 1 and language programs are described. Chapter 4 presents our conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF LEP STUDENTS FOR CHAPTER 1

In this chapter we address how districts and schools identify LEP students and, in turn, select some of those LEP students for Chapter 1 services. We begin with a discussion of LEP identification procedures. The second section is a description of conditions that must be met prior to assessment for Chapter 1, which is followed by a discussion of the Chapter 1 selection procedures used by the districts, including the types of tests and other measures employed. Next is a discussion of the factors that appear to affect which procedures are used. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the adequacy of the Chapter 1 selection measures as applied to LEP students.

Identifying Students as Limited English Proficient

To the extent that districts restrict or limit LEP student involvement in Chapter 1, the definitions of who is considered a LEP student become significant. No standard, national definition of limited English proficiency exists. It is up to state and local education personnel to determine the point at which limited English proficiency becomes English proficiency and to decide how to measure whether that point has been reached. While this study did not seek to compare students across districts, it seemed as if some of the students labeled LEP in several districts would have been labeled proficient in several others simply because the local definitions differed. The purpose of this section is to describe the local procedures for identifying LEP students.

Definitions and Procedures

SEA and district policies and procedures related to identifying LEP students can be described in terms of four characteristics:

- who to assess;
- what measures and standards to use;
- whether parents have to consent; and
- whether reassessment procedures are specified.

Table 2.1 indicates whether the SEAs and districts in this study had specific policies for these characteristics.

Looking first at the SEAs, A and D set specific policies in most of the four areas, and C and F were more permissive, setting policies covering about half of the characteristics. Two states, B and E, provided little or no guidance, leaving most areas to local discretion. The following descriptions, based on state documents or discussions with appropriate officials, reflect each of these three state patterns.

Specific:

All students are required to have a home-language survey signed by parents on file. Each student with a language other than English on the home language survey reported for the student or parents/adults in the household is to be assessed within 30 days of enrollment. The *oral* English proficiency of students whose parents report any language but English on the home language survey is to be assessed with a state-designated instrument. An English *reading and writing* skills assessment is required for students in grades 3 and above who are rated as LEP on their oral skills alone; districts can also require reading and writing assessments for students in lower grades. It is up to districts to establish a process for assessing reading and writing skills. Parents must be informed of the results of the language assessments and must give permission for the classification and subsequent placement of the student. For reclassification as English proficient, student must meet district criteria including teacher evaluation, English oral proficiency, parental permission, English writing skills, and skills in English reading, language arts, and mathematics.

Permissive:

At the time of school registration, the school secretary is to identify potential LEP students. The parent must complete a home language survey to determine the student's primary language background, i.e., either the language spoken by the student or his/her family. District personnel must interview potential LEP students to determine their English proficiency level. Parents have the right to remove their child

Table 2.1

SEA and District-level Policies for Identifying LEP Students

SEA/District	Describes Who to Assess	Specific Skills, Measures, and Standards	Requires Parent Consent	Sets Reassessment Procedures
A	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
A1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
A2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
A3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
B	No	No	No	No
B1	Yes	Yes	No	No
B2	Yes	No	Yes	No
C	Yes	No	Yes	No
C1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
C2	Yes	No	No	No
C3	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
D	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
D1	No	No	Yes	No
D2	Yes	Yes	No	No
E	No	No	No	No
E1	Yes	Yes	No	No
E2	Yes	Yes	No	No
F	Yes	No	No	No
F1	Yes	Yes	No	No
F2	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

from a bilingual education program placement at any time. Students must have their English language skills in aural comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing reassessed annually.

Local Discretion:

There must be programs at the local level addressing language proficiency. All specific policies and procedures for LEP identification are to be established at the district level. Districts should use a home language survey to determine the language used in the home, and they should identify specific instruments for assessment and placement. Exit criteria must be established for each language instruction program. Parents are not required to consent to placements.

Table 2.1 indicates that districts' policies tend to reflect the policies of their SEAs. When SEA guidelines and requirements are ambiguous or absent (as for the "local discretion" states B and E), then districts, as would be expected, establish their own, and differences among the districts within a state appear to be pronounced. When SEA policies are specific, by and large the districts have fewer alternatives and tend to look more alike.

District Policies and Definitions

Determining Who to Assess. All but one of the districts had a policy that described who was to be assessed to determine their level of English proficiency. Typically, determining who to assess was based on a home language survey completed by parents at the time of registration. If any language other than English for students or their parents/guardians was listed on this home language survey, then the students in the family were to be assessed. In the one district without a formal policy, school staff were trained to identify students who appeared to have trouble with English and to refer them for further assessment. The following is a typical example of local policies and procedures about who to assess:

District C1 follows state-mandated procedures for identifying LEP students, beginning with a screening process at student registration. A home-language survey is given to parents. If a student is identified as coming from a non-English background, an individual student language assessment is conducted by school bilingual staff.

Measures and Standards to Use. All visited districts specified the skills to be assessed in identifying LEP students and the measures to use. At a minimum, oral language proficiency was assessed in all districts, and a few of the districts initially assessed other skills, including English reading and writing skills, as a further check on the oral proficiency results and as a first step in placement. As a rule, districts required multiple measures for LEP student identification; table 2.2 lists the tests or other measures used in each district. A typical pattern included administration of an oral English language test followed by an English-language achievement test for students with some English to determine their LEP status. As an example of multiple-instrument use, three tests were used at the elementary level in district B2, including the Shutt Primary Language Indicators Test, the IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test, and the Language Assessment Battery. In addition, oral interviews were conducted by speakers of the student's native language in both the native language and English, as appropriate. The rationale for the use of so many measures in district B2 was to deemphasize the importance of any one test or the interview.

Most of the districts also set standards, e.g., cut-off scores, for test performance to identify LEP students, but some left the final determination of LEP status up to staff judgments. In a few districts where multiple instruments were used, the scores were combined into a composite for which overall performance standards were set. In other cases with multiple tests, the tests were administered and the standards applied sequentially. The following are examples of standards set by districts that used multiple measures:

> District E2 uses a composite score. The major test to determine language need is the IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test, but the Woodcock Reading Test is also used to assess reading and writing skills in Spanish and in English. The results of these tests are combined to produce a range of English language proficiency. Level I is a non-English speaker; level II is a limited English speaker; level III is an English speaker who may be considered LEP if low in English reading and high in Spanish mastery.

Table 2.2

Tests Used to Identify LEP Students

District	English-Language Proficiency Tests	Standardized Achievement Tests	Other Measures
A1	LAS	CAT	
A2	IPT	CTBS, La Prueba	
A3	LAS	MAT	Primary language tests
B1	Local test, LAMS		Staff judgment
B2	SPLIT, IPT, LAB	SABE	Oral interviews
C1	FLA		Reading, writing tests
C2	FLA, PPVT		Reading, writing tests
C3	LAS		
D1	IPT, BSM, LAB, Carrow, Maculaitis		Teacher, parent input
D2	IPT	SRA or other	
E1	BSM, LAB, LAS, SLEP, TALS	SABE	
E2	IPT	Woodcock	Preliminary language screen
F1	LAS	CAT	
F2	LAS	Brigance, Moreno	

Brigance	Brigance K-1 Screening Test
BSM	Bilingual Syntax Measure
Carrow	Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language
CAT	California Achievement Test
CTBS	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
FLA	Functional Language Assessment
IPT	IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test
LAB	Language Assessment Battery
LAMS	Language Assessment Management System
LAS	Language Assessment Survey
La Prueba	La Prueba Riverside de Realizacion en Espanol
Maculaitis	Maculaitis Assessment Program
MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
Moreno	Moreno Oral English Proficiency Test
PPVT	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
SABE	Spanish Assessment for Basic Education
SLEP	Secondary Level English Proficiency
SPLIT	Shutt Primary Language Indicators Test
SRA	Science Research Associates
TALS	Test of Awareness of Language Segments
Woodcock	Woodcock Reading Test (English or Spanish)

> District A1 applies standards sequentially. Students in grades 3-6 who score 1, 2, or 3 on the Language Assessment Survey are labeled as LEP and offered bilingual education services in a replacement setting. For students who are rated 4 or 5 on the LAS, i.e., high on oral English, the district looks at their California Achievement Test scores. If achievement test scores are below the 36th percentile on any subscale, then the student is labeled LEP.

Parental consent. All of the visited districts have implemented provisions for formal notification of parents of the results of the LEP identification and assessment process. Several of the districts also required parental approval before a LEP student can be placed in special language services, and a few districts even mandated explicit parent approvals before the child can be assessed for special language services. Those listed on table 2.1 as having consent policies required parent approvals before district or school staff can place the child in any language program.

Reassessment Procedures. Most of the visited districts had policies requiring reassessment of identified LEP students at regular intervals, usually each year, with one district requiring reassessment each semester. Several districts also set very detailed requirements for LEP students to be reclassified as English proficient, but most provided little or no guidance at all to local educators. The following is an example of a detailed policy:

> For reclassification from limited to fully English proficient in district A3, students must: (1) receive a teacher evaluation on the student oral language observation matrix with ratings of 4 or 5; (2) score 4 or 5 on the Language Assessment Survey; (3) produce a writing sample comparable in performance to English speakers; (4) score in the 36th percentile or higher on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills reading, math, and language arts tests (for students between 32nd and 35th percentile, student appraisal teams can override scores); and (5) the student's parents must approve the reclassification.

Procedures for Selecting LEP Students for Chapter 1

Selection of students for Chapter 1 normally requires a district to apply selection criteria (e.g., a test score) uniformly at particular grade levels. That is, the same test or other criterion is used for all students. Selection of LEP students, however, falls within a section on "special rules" within the

regulations because of the need to avoid confounding the effects of educational deprivation and limited English proficiency. This section describes the federal requirements and discusses state and district policies and procedures in the case study sites.

Federal Requirements

Recognizing that LEP children cannot usually be tested or assessed with the same measures used for English proficient students, the law and regulations provide for alternative procedures. The procedures, however, should produce comparable results since, to be served by Chapter 1, LEP students are to be "selected on the same basis as other children identified as eligible for and selected to receive services" based on the annual assessment of student needs conducted by the district (200.31(c)(5)(i)(B)). This clearly does not mean the district must use the same test for LEP and other students. In identifying and selecting LEP children for Chapter 1 services, the LEA can:

> (A) for children with sufficient English-language proficiency, use tests written in the English language, with or without bilingual assistance; or
>
> (B) for children whose lack of English-language proficiency precludes valid assessment in the English language, use factors such as teacher evaluation of student performance, language dominance tests in combination with other measures, or other indicators that may be used separately, as a composite score, or as a composite with weighting, to select children on a basis other than English language deficiency (200.31(c)(5)(ii)).

The choice of procedures appears to be up to local officials. The only requirements are that the procedures result in the selection of LEP students who have the needs identified in the district's overall needs assessment and that they select students with needs stemming from educational deprivation and not solely from their lack of proficiency in English.

State Policies and Procedures

State policies appear to have direct effects on local practices in selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 when they provide specific information about procedures and requirements and when they are reinforced by monitoring provisions. At the time of the site visits, all but one of the states included in this study had formulated state policies on Chapter 1 services to LEP students, but most made few efforts to ensure district personnel understood the policies and their implications.

Two of the six states made the eligibility of LEP children for Chapter 1 explicit in statements to their districts. State A issued a formal program advisory to all districts that restated the federal law and non-regulatory guidance regarding Chapter 1 services to LEP students. In addition, that SEA recommended native language testing, examination of academic history, observation, and other informal assessment methods for determining whether a LEP student was educationally disadvantaged. State F was also aware of the difficulties in serving LEP students in Chapter 1 and stressed that LEP students should be eligible for Chapter 1 if they are educationally deprived as well as language deficient.

The other four SEAs took a less active stance. At the extreme, one SEA had no policy at all at the time of this visit. More typical was the policy of state C, which set prerequisites for Chapter 1 selection:

> Chapter 1 programs must assume that LEP students already have sufficient oral language skills in order to benefit from the services provided in English and with materials in English. In addition, LEP students must meet all of the existing requirements for Chapter 1 service and it must be determined that existing Chapter 1 programs can actually meet the assessed needs of a particular LEP student.

State A was the only one of the SEAs to implement compliance monitoring procedures related to the provision of services to LEP students. Among other points, monitors in state A were to ensure:

> Chapter 1 funds are used to provide supplemental educational services to LEP and/or handicapped students when they meet the criteria for Chapter 1 participation.

Coordination between Chapter 1 and the bilingual education offices at the SEAs was common in only one state, occurred occasionally in two of the others, and was rare in the remaining three states. In state F, the one in which coordination was common, the bilingual and Chapter 1 offices are housed together, and staff meet on occasion to discuss coordination of the programs. Office proximity, however, may not be sufficient to promote cooperation as the following observation indicates:

> There is apparently no coordination at the state level of services for LEP students and Chapter 1 students in state C, even though the offices that oversee the administration of the two programs are housed within the same SEA office.

In summary, few of the states in this study made more than modest efforts to inform their districts that LEP students may be served in Chapter 1. Indeed, only one of the states considered the issue important enough to include the topic as part of its Chapter 1 compliance reviews. Finally, coordination was rare at the state level; our impression is that the two programs exist separately in most states, with different histories and agendas.

Local Policies and Procedures

We found that district personnel used a wide variety of tests and other measures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills and ESL, including English-language proficiency tests, standardized achievement tests, teacher rating scales, and other uses of teacher judgment. The use of these measures is described in this section.[2]

English-Language Proficiency Tests. English-language proficiency tests are used to assess a student's ability to use oral and/or written English. As we noted in the previous section, English-language proficiency tests were used to identify LEP students in all the districts. Because of their use

[2]In this section, a distinction is made between Chapter 1 basic skills (i.e., reading, math, and language arts) and Chapter 1 ESL because local Chapter 1 selection procedure for LEP students tended to differ along these lines.

in identifying LEP students, these tests play the single most important role in selecting LEP students for Chapter 1. The tests may be used (directly or indirectly): 1) to make LEP students ineligible for Chapter 1 basic skills programs; 2) to determine what set of procedures are used for Chapter 1 student selection; or 3) in conjunction with other Chapter 1 selection criteria, to select LEP students for Chapter 1 ESL services.

In six districts, students with low scores on English-language proficiency tests were not considered eligible for any Chapter 1 services and therefore their level of educational deprivation was not assessed in more direct ways. In effect, students had to perform at a high level on the English-language proficiency test if they were to be served in the Chapter 1 programs (which were basic skills oriented), making English proficiency a prior condition for Chapter 1 selection.

In all but one of the other eight districts, students with limited English proficiency were selected for Chapter 1 basic skills using different procedures than English-proficient students. Thus, the English language proficiency tests also played a major role in these districts by determining, for example, whether a student would take an English-language achievement test or one in Spanish.

In four districts that offered Chapter 1 funded ESL services, a student was first identified as limited English proficient based on an English-language proficiency test. Then, additional Chapter 1 selection criteria were applied for placement in Chapter 1 ESL programs.

Table 2.3 provides information about the prior conditions for Chapter 1 eligibility for LEP students. Eight districts set at least one prior condition for Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility for LEP students that was not required of English-proficient students, and most of those prerequisites concerned levels of English proficiency. In several cases, the requirement for a minimum level of English proficiency was stated in terms of a score on a specific English language proficiency test; these included, for example, achieving at level C or higher on the IDEA Language Proficiency Test in

Table 2.3

Prior Conditions to be Met by LEP Students for Selection into Chapter 1 Basic Skills

District	Prerequisite	Does the Prerequisite Apply to English-Proficient Students?
A1	None	-
A2	None	-
A3	None	-
B1	(1) Enrolled for 40 days	Yes
	(2) Approval by school committee	No
B2	Exit from intensive English program	No
C1	(1) Recommendation by teacher	Yes
	(2) Not in bilingual replacement	No
C2	None	-
C3	Score of 4 or 5 on LAS	No
D1	Minimum level of English skill	No
D2	(1) Level C or higher on IPT	No
	(2) Not placed in TESOL center	No
E1	Classroom and ESL teacher approve test	No
E2	None	-
F1	(1) Capable of valid CAT score	Yes
	(2) In a non-bilingual education school	No
	(3) Not receiving service from other program	Yes
F2	None	-

district D2 or obtaining a score of 4 or higher on the Language Assessment Survey in district C3. In other districts, the requirement to achieve a certain score on an English-language proficiency test was indirect, being phrased in terms of a program placement resulting from the score rather than the score itself. An example from district B2 involved a requirement for exiting the intensive English program. Similar requirements included attaining a "minimum level" of English skill (as in district D1) or a statement from the teacher that the student could obtain a reliable score on an English-language

achievement test (district F1). Regardless of the form taken by the requirement, the significant point is that districts set prior conditions for Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility for LEP students that had no parallel for English-proficient ones.

The requirement by some districts that LEP students reach a predetermined level of English proficiency before being considered for Chapter 1 basic skills raises an important issue. When the required level is set high, districts that claim to serve LEP students in Chapter 1 basic skills may in fact serve only language minority students who are largely English proficient in their oral/aural, reading, and writing skills. At the extreme, two or three of the visited districts appear to have set such high levels of English proficiency as a prior condition for Chapter 1 basic skills participation that only a handful of the students who are currently *limited* English proficient actually get served by Chapter 1, except by Chapter 1-funded ESL.

English-Language Achievement Tests. In every district, standardized English-language achievement tests in math and reading were used to select English proficient and some LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills; table 2.4 lists those achievement tests. These tests were sometimes used in conjunction with teacher judgment, but the test scores and predetermined cut-off scores for eligibility were usually the most important measures being used, particularly for English-proficient students.

Most districts did not administer English-language achievement tests to most of their LEP students, even with bilingual assistance as permitted by Chapter 1 regulations. In several districts, in fact, the site visitors were informed by language services staff that LEP students were specifically shielded from the English-language achievement tests to protect their self-esteem. At the same time, problems did arise occasionally. For example, in one district where most of the LEP students were concentrated in a single school, the few LEP students who remained in the other schools took the English-language achievement test along with the English-proficient students.

Table 2.4

Achievement Tests for Chapter 1 Selection

District	English-Language Achievement Tests	Cut-off Score	Primary Language Achievement Tests	Cut-off Score
A1	CAT, WRAT	49th percentile	La Prueba	49th percentile
A2	CTBS	49th percentile	*	
A3	CTBS, MAT, WRAT, Nelson	45th percentile	La Prueba, SABE	45th percentile
B1	CTBS	30th percentile		
B2	SAT	49th percentile	SABE	49th percentile
C1	ITBS	Below grade level		
C2	ITBS, CTBS	Below grade level		
C3	ITBS	Below grade level	*	
D1	CAT	39th percentile		
D1	SRA	39th percentile		
E1	MAT	49th percentile		
E2	MAT	49th percentile	SABE	49th percentile
F1	CAT (others may be used)	25th percentile		
F2	Brigance, G-M, Woodcock	**	Woodcock	**

* La Prueba administered to Spanish-speaking students, but not used for Chapter 1 selection.
** Used as part of a component measure.

Brigance	Brigance K-1 Screening Test
CAT	California Achievement Test
CTBS	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
G-M	Gates-McGinitie Reading Test
ITBS	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
La Prueba	La Prueba Riverside de Realizacion en Espanol
MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
Nelson	Nelson Reading Skills Test
SABE	Spanish Assessment for Basic Education
SAT	Stanford Achievement Test
SRA	Science Research Associates
Woodcock	Woodcock Reading Test (English or Spanish)
WRAT	Wide Range Achievement Test

A related issue concerns the cut-off scores for Chapter 1 eligibility in districts that require LEP students to be exiting from language services before they can be considered eligible for Chapter 1 basic skills remediation. The problem stems from LEP students having to reach a certain percentile rank on the English-language achievement test to exit language services, with that percentile rank actually near the Chapter 1 cut-off score. In other words, achievement levels that allow the student to exit from language services are near the upper limit of scores that permit the student to be served by Chapter 1. For example, district B2 set a prior condition on LEP students that they have exited from language services and, to exit from language services, required a stanine score on the achievement test of at least 4 (which corresponds to a percentile rank above 22). This left a very small Chapter 1 qualifying range for LEP students, since priority for Chapter 1 reading services was given to students who score below the 25th percentile. In these districts, we observed that other procedures, such as teacher judgments, can be used to override the test results, but our impression was that at least some LEP students who could have benefitted from both language services and Chapter 1 compensatory services did not have an opportunity to participate in the latter.

Primary-Language Achievement Tests. Primary-language standardized achievement tests were used to select Spanish-speaking LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills in five of the districts. These districts treated the primary-language tests as being directly comparable to the English-language achievement tests they used, even to the point of assuming equivalency of subtests and norm-referenced scores. These five are indicated on table 2.4. The tests used included the Spanish Assessment for Basic Education (SABE), La Prueba Riverside de Realizacion en Espanol (La Prueba), and the Woodcock reading test. No standardized primary-language achievement test in a language other than Spanish was used in any of the visited districts.

Although most of the districts using primary-language achievement tests had relatively large numbers of Spanish-speaking LEP students, some districts with larger numbers or higher proportions of Spanish-speaking LEP students did not use them. In fact, the one thing that seemed to characterize the districts that used primary-language tests was the widespread provision of transitional bilingual education throughout the district. The districts we visited that provided bilingual education in only one or a handful of special schools did not use primary language achievement tests for Chapter 1 basic skills selection.

English-Language Criterion-Referenced Tests. Seven of the districts used English-language criterion-referenced tests as part of their basic skills selection process. (Table 2.5 indicates whether criterion-referenced tests were used in the districts.) Frequently this was because a standardized norm-referenced test was not available at a particular grade-level (usually K or 1). In those cases where an English-language criterion-referenced test was used at most or all grade levels, the test was administered to LEP students only if they were in a mainstreamed placement. Since these LEP students had generally demonstrated high levels of English proficiency in reading and writing in order to be placed in English-only setting, we noted few instances where LEP students were actually selected for Chapter 1 basic skills using these criterion-referenced tests.

Primary-Language Criterion-Referenced Tests. Two districts administered primary-language criterion-referenced tests as part of the Chapter 1 basic skills selection process, each for a different reason. District A3 used the criterion-referenced test to determine the eligibility of LEP students whose primary language was not Spanish:

> Non-Spanish speaking LEP students who have not been in an English reading program since the previous November are given a locally developed assessment in their native language. The district developed this test specifically to assess students for Chapter 1 for whom a standardized test does not exist. It was designed to be easily translated so it could be used with students in any language. Standard versions are currently available in Vietnamese, Portuguese, and a few other languages, and the test is administered by primary-language speakers.

Table 2.5

Criterion-Referenced Tests for Chapter 1 Selection, by District*

District	English-Language Criterion-Referenced Tests	Primary-Language Criterion-Referenced Tests
A1		
A2		
A3		Yes
B1		
B2		
C1		
C2		
C3	Yes	
D1	Yes	
D2	Yes	
E1	Yes	
E2		
F1	Yes	
F2	Yes	Yes

* No entry indicates that a criterion-referenced test was not used in the district for selection of Chapter 1 students.

In district F2, all students take the district-developed criterion-referenced test (in English or Spanish) as a component of a composite measure for Chapter 1 basic skills selection. In both of these cases, and particularly in district A3, the effect of using these tests was that students with strong primary-language skills, particularly in reading, were not placed in Chapter 1.

Teacher Judgment. Teacher judgments in one of several forms were used in all but one of the visited districts. Here, it should be noted, "teacher judgment" refers to a process that may involve

a single teacher or may involve several teachers, resource personnel, and the principal. The judgments served one of three purposes: (1) to "adjust" the ranking or eligibility of students based on test results; (2) to serve a gatekeeping function, e.g., without a referral from a teacher or other staff member, a student could not be tested for Chapter 1 eligibility; or (3) to serve as the direct selection measure for Chapter 1. Information on the use of teacher judgment in Chapter 1 selection is presented in table 2.6.

Teachers occasionally found it necessary to intervene in cases where they believed that test scores had given an inaccurate picture of a student's achievement level. Sometimes this practice was formalized:

> District E2 uses the 40th percentile as a cut-off point in determining Chapter 1 eligibility. In addition to the test criterion, based on teacher judgment, up to 5 percent of students scoring above the 40th percentile may be served in Chapter 1.

Table 2.6

Use of Teacher Judgments for Chapter 1 Selection

District	Staff Involved	Procedure/Method	Primary Purpose
A1	Teacher	Review Scores	Direct Selection
A2	Teacher, Principal	Checklist	Direct Selection
A3	NA		
B1	Teacher & Committee	Referral Form	Direct Selection
B2	Teacher	Checklist	Direct Selection
C1	Teacher or Principal	Review Scores	Adjust Ranking
C2	Bldg. Screening Com.	Review Scores	Direct Selection
C3	Teacher & Committee	Checklist	Adjust Ranking
D1	Teacher	Review Scores	Adjust Ranking
D2	Teacher	Checklist	Adjust Ranking
E1	Teacher or Others	Referral Form	Referral for Testing
E2	Teacher	Review Scores	Adjust Ranking
F1	Teacher	Referral Form	Referral for Testing
F2	Teacher	Checklist	Direct Selection

Usually the practice was more informal:

> In district C3, teacher judgment is sometimes used to place a student in Chapter 1 when the teacher feels the test score does not accurately reflect student need.

The gatekeeping function was noted in district F1. While a test score was the major criterion for Chapter 1 basic skills selection in that district, the regular classroom teachers were also responsible for deciding whether a LEP student took the test.

A few districts used teacher judgment to select LEP students directly for Chapter 1 basic skills. Administrators in district A2 developed a teacher checklist because primary-language tests were not available for many of the district's LEP students because of the large number of languages represented; as a result teacher judgment was the only measure used for selecting LEP students:

> In district A2, the teacher checklist is to be filled out at least annually for all students who are judged to have insufficient English proficiency to be tested in English *and* who have been formally identified as LEP. The teacher notes agreement or disagreement with four statements about the student's reading and math skills. The four statements cover appropriateness of grade placement, satisfactory progression in instruction provided in English, satisfactory progression in instruction provided in the primary language, and satisfactory progression in ESL.

It should be noted that having a district-level policy in place to use teacher judgment or any other selection tool does not necessarily mean it is widely used. Consider, for example, district D1:

> The district D1 policy on serving LEP students in Chapter 1 indicates that student need must be caused by educational deprivation, not language deficiency, and the district suggests that information on the student's educational needs be gathered from ESL teachers, classroom teachers, family members, and education records to determine if a LEP student is educationally disadvantaged. However, several Chapter 1 teachers indicated that teacher judgment was seldom used in Chapter 1 selection.

School-Level Practices

School personnel generally followed the procedures put in place by the district for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1. The few school-level deviations from district policies that we identified appeared to result from either faculty or student characteristics that made the school somewhat unique,

such as a high proportion of non-Spanish speaking LEP students, or from disagreements with district policy. For example, school personnel who questioned the validity of the primary-language achievement test required by the district for determining Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility were slightly more likely to use teacher judgment in making their final decisions. This school-level concurrence with Chapter 1 selection was also observed in regard to LEP identification procedures, suggesting that district staff had taken an active role in disseminating the procedures to be followed or, in many cases, actually conducting the identification and selection steps themselves.

Comparison of Chapter 1 Selection Procedures for LEP and English-proficient Students

Process of Selection. Most of the districts in this study used different Chapter 1 basic skills selection procedures for LEP students than for English-proficient students. Establishing Chapter 1 basic skills selection prerequisites for LEP students that had no parallel for English-proficient students was the most obvious difference. At their most extreme, prerequisites for high English-language proficiency levels effectively eliminated all but a few LEP students from being considered for Chapter 1 basic skills. In addition, several districts required LEP students to pass through what looked to be relatively cumbersome teacher referral processes prior to being tested or in lieu of testing for Chapter 1. Further, English-proficient students in some of the districts qualified for Chapter 1 basic skills through scores on district-developed criterion-referenced tests, but the parallel use of primary-language criterion-referenced tests for LEP students was rare. In short, the procedures in some districts for selecting LEP students did differ dramatically from those used to select English-proficient students. Whether those radically different procedures appeared to produce comparable results is discussed in a later section.

Burden. School personnel did not see Chapter 1 selection procedures related to LEP children, at least in comparison to procedures for English-proficient students, as posing a substantial burden for

two reasons. First, LEP program personnel at the school or district level, rather than those in Chapter 1 or the regular classroom, typically performed the language assessments, which served as a major prerequisite. Second, the burden may be seen as smaller for LEP students because staff relied more on referrals and other teacher judgments than on achievement test scores.

Factors Affecting Local Policies and Procedures for Selecting LEP Students for Chapter 1

In this section, we examine several other factors that we expected to affect the policies and procedures implemented by local administrators and educators for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1. Specifically, we discuss the characteristics of the LEP students themselves, and the design of the local Chapter 1 programs.

Characteristics of the LEP Student Population

We expected two characteristics of a districts' LEP student population to be related to district Chapter 1 selection policies and procedures. These included (1) the proportion (and total number) of LEP students in the district and (2) the presence of relatively large proportions of LEP students with a primary language other than Spanish. We examined the relationship between the characteristics of a district's LEP students and whether the district established prior conditions for Chapter 1 basic skills selection that LEP students had to meet.

Five of the districts could be classified as having both high proportions (over 10 percent) and large numbers (more than 1,000) of LEP students. These districts included A1, A2, A3, D2, and F1. Only one of these districts had implemented an eligibility prerequisite unique to LEP students: in district F1, LEP students had to be judged to have sufficient English by their classroom teacher to obtain a valid score on an English-language achievement test before being given that test. At the other extreme, four districts, including B2, C2, D1, and E1, could be classified as having relatively small

proportions (less than 5 percent) and small numbers of LEP students (less than 1,000). Three of these had implemented prior conditions for LEP students. These results, while certainly not conclusive, suggest that district policies are at least likely to be related to the size and proportion of the LEP student body.

We also sought to determine whether any relationship might exist between setting requirements that LEP students have to meet high standards of English proficiency prior to being eligible for Chapter 1 basic skills and the presence of large numbers of LEP students with languages other than Spanish. This analysis did not indicate that a relationship existed between those variables. At the same time, individual districts have had to respond to the need to find procedures for determining the Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility of LEP students when no primary-language achievement test exists. Most commonly, the solution has been to rely on teacher judgment.

> In district A1, students who speak languages other than Spanish or English are given English tests or, if there is a statement from the child's teacher that the child cannot take an English test, teacher judgment is used to determine Chapter 1 eligibility.

Design of Local Chapter 1 and Special Language Programs

District philosophy, staff qualifications, current service delivery models, and subjects interact and help define each program and set boundaries and areas of overlap between them. This section addresses ways in which two of these aspects of the programs, district philosophy and staffing, affect selection of LEP students for Chapter 1. A detailed discussion of service delivery models and subjects is included in the next chapter.

District Philosophy. One factor that clearly played a role in the selection of LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills is the philosophy of local staff. The philosophy was generally stated as one of two distinct perspectives. Those holding one perspective asserted that English proficiency must be attained before educational deprivation can be diagnosed and addressed. Proponents of the other

philosophy believed that educational deprivation can be identified and addressed regardless of English language proficiency. Typically, staff in a particular district consistently voiced one perspective or the other and used that perspective to develop district policy regarding whether and how LEP students were served in Chapter 1.

These two philosophical perspectives about serving LEP students in Chapter 1 basic skills generally were paralleled by district service patterns:

- In districts with *sequentially ordered services*, local staff believe that language deficiencies must be addressed before other learning problems can be identified and addressed. Therefore, LEP students need a prescribed level of English language proficiency before being assessed for Chapter 1 basic skills.

- In districts with *simultaneous services*, local staff believe that academic deficiencies can be identified and addressed regardless of English language proficiency level. Therefore, LEP students are eligible to receive Chapter 1 compensatory services and non-Chapter 1 language services simultaneously.

Characteristics of districts with sequential perspectives and sequentially ordered services. In districts and schools where staff believe that English-language proficiency must be achieved first, students with low levels of English-language skills are rarely served in Chapter 1 reading or math programs. Rather, the Chapter 1 selection practices for LEP students are also sequential: first, students are to acquire English-language skills; then they may be assessed for Chapter 1 basic skills remediation. Once the prescribed level of English-language proficiency has been reached, LEP students are typically assessed, selected, and served in Chapter 1 basic skills in the same way as English-proficient students. This philosophy was voiced by one respondent who said,

> "With a young child, less than third grade, I would give him at least three years in the ESL program to learn the language before I even started looking for other learning problems."

Characteristics of districts with simultaneous perspectives and simultaneous services. When local staff believed that LEP students could be identified as educationally deprived and their educational deprivation could be addressed regardless of English-language proficiency, LEP students typically received Chapter 1 basic skills and language services simultaneously. Many of the districts with a simultaneous service model used primary language testing (at least for Spanish speakers) to identify students who had low educational attainment in their native language and to select LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills services provided in the native language. In several of these districts, language services were provided in a replacement setting (i.e., a separate classroom) and LEP students were pulled out for supplemental Chapter 1 assistance.

The two perspectives driving simultaneous and sequential service provision and the corresponding selection procedures were typically grouped by state. As shown in table 2.7, staff in state A's districts believed that language deficiency and educational deprivation could be addressed simultaneously, and the districts used a simultaneous service model. In states C and D, on the other hand, district staff believed that language needs should be addressed prior to the identification of other educational problems, and the districts used a sequential service model.

Characteristics of "other" districts. In state E, the districts' philosophy was sequential but the service models were simultaneous. LEP students with low levels of English language skills could receive Chapter 1-funded ESL services, while English-proficient students and LEP students with high levels of English-language proficiency could receive Chapter 1 reading or math services. So, LEP students at all levels of English-language proficiency could receive some Chapter 1 services, but the underlying philosophy guiding service delivery was still sequential--first address language needs, then academic needs.

Table 2.7

Philosophies and Models for Serving LEP Students in Chapter 1 by State and District

State/District	Philosophy	Service Model
A1	Simultaneous	Simultaneous
A2	Simultaneous	Simultaneous
A3	Simultaneous	Simultaneous
B1	Simultaneous	Simultaneous
B1	Sequential	Sequential
C1	Sequential	Sequential
C2	Sequential	Sequential
C3	Sequential	Sequential
D1	Sequential	Sequential
D1	Sequential	Sequential
E1	Sequential	Simultaneous
E2	Sequential	Simultaneous
F1	Sequential	Sequential
F2	Simultaneous	Sequential

In state B, at the time of the case studies there was very little state guidance about the identification of LEP students, the types of language services that should be used to address language deficiencies, or the eligibility of LEP students for categorical programs. This may explain why the two districts visited in state B differed in philosophy and service model, with one adopting a sequential philosophy and model while the other approached and provided services simultaneously.

District F2, with a simultaneous philosophy and a sequential service model, was unique. LEP students with low levels of English-language proficiency received compensatory reading services in Spanish through the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program. Students with higher levels of English-language proficiency received English reading assistance through Chapter 1 basic. This district

differed from those in state E because students received Spanish-language reading instruction services, rather than ESL, through the Chapter 1 migrant program. The philosophy behind this program design was simultaneous: the students' academic needs, as well as their language needs, were being addressed at an early stage of English-language development. The Chapter 1 basic grants program, however, required LEP students to attain fairly high levels of English language proficiency before serving them.

The differences between the two districts in state F are difficult to explain. The state appears to encourage a simultaneous approach to serving LEP students in Chapter 1 basic skills and transitional bilingual language services for LEP students. State regulations, however, permit alternative approaches to serving LEP students, and it appears that district F1 chose one alternative approach, possibly as the result of the large diversity of language groups represented in the district.

Staff Qualifications and Attitudes. A district's philosophy in serving LEP students in Chapter 1 basic skills was closely linked to the qualifications of its Chapter 1 staff. All of the districts with selection procedures that resulted in large numbers of LEP students being served simultaneously in Chapter 1 basic skills programs and language programs for LEP students had Chapter 1 staff who taught bilingually or were trained in ESL techniques. The Chapter 1 teachers in these districts were accustomed to working with LEP students, felt they could effectively serve them, and were quite adamant in claims that Chapter 1 reading and ESL were two very different programs with unique goals and curricula. All of the districts with a simultaneous service philosophy also used primary language instruction for LEP students, and the presence of bilingual staff may have facilitated assessment of LEP students for Chapter 1 remediation. Without a bilingual staff, LEP students below the appropriate level of educational attainment for their age in their native language (i.e., who were educationally

disadvantaged in their native language) would not have their deficiencies identified until they reached a sufficient level of proficiency in English to be tested in English.

Districts following the sequential service model, on the other hand, varied widely in the number and percentage of LEP students enrolled and percentage who spoke Spanish. Some had high proportions of LEP students and Spanish speakers as well as bilingual staff, which made them similar to simultaneous-service districts, but in most of the sequential-services districts, Chapter 1 had neither bilingual staff nor staff trained in ESL techniques. Chapter 1 staff in these districts usually felt they were not qualified to work with LEP students or voiced the opinion that service from too many different programs would detract from the student's primary need to acquire English-language skills.

Another factor influenced districts' preferences for sequential service. A small number of special language staff in these districts did not feel LEP students should be served in Chapter 1 because they felt that the Chapter 1 label stigmatized children. This may reflect an opinion that assessment tools are not adequate in distinguishing between language proficiency and educational deprivation, so disproportionate numbers of LEP students may be identified for Chapter 1 remediation simply because tests do not accurately assess skills. This feeling may also reflect the historic placement of minority students in remedial or special education programs simply on the basis of their race/ethnicity, language, or culture.

There was also a feeling among some local staff that, given limited funds, students should be restricted to a small number of categorical programs in order to serve more students overall or to increase the intensity of service to the most needy.

> "There aren't enough services to go around. If they're eligible for something else, we don't want them in Chapter 1."

Adequacy of Chapter 1 Selection Procedures for LEP Students

We used three criteria to judge the adequacy of Chapter 1 basic skills selection procedures for LEP students: (1) whether the procedures distinguish between English-language deficiency and educational deprivation; (2) whether the procedures are comparable to the extent they appear to lead to the selection of English-proficient and limited English proficient students with similar needs; and (3) whether the procedures result in the selection of roughly proportional numbers of LEP and English-proficient students for Chapter 1 basic skills services.

Distinguish Educational Deprivation from English-Language Deficiency

P.L. 100-297 indicates that LEP students may be served in Chapter 1 if they have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not solely from English language deficiency. This point is stressed in the Chapter 1 Policy Manual, which states:

> [I]f LEP children have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not solely from their lack of proficiency in English, the children must be identified as eligible and selected for Chapter 1 services on the same basis as other Chapter 1 children. (p. 64).

To analyze each district's procedures, we divided the criterion of ability to distinguish educational deprivation from English language deficiency into three elements: (1) whether the procedures used to select LEP students focused on academic achievement; (2) whether the district used multiple measures; and (3) whether the district tested students in their primary language. The first element, i.e., whether the procedures emphasized academic skills, is a straightforward measure of whether the procedures can distinguish educational deprivation from language deficiency. The other two elements are less straightforward, however, and need some explanation. Using multiple measures is important because selection on a single measure, usually an achievement test score, can lead to selection errors, particularly for students near the cut-off score, such as students who also have

English-language deficiencies that can suppress their scores. Using additional measures, such as the judgments of teachers, can correct some of those errors. The third element, testing students in their primary language, is another way to avoid errors; but, more importantly, it may be the most efficient way to obtain a valid measure of a LEP student's level of academic achievement, particularly when the student has very low English-language skills. Table 2.8 presents a summary of each district's procedures in terms of these three elements and the other major criteria of adequacy.

Focus on academic achievement. Most of the districts typically assessed academic achievement rather than English-language deficiency only for English-proficient students and those LEP students who had already demonstrated at least some English language skills, i.e., they had met a prior condition for Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility. Several other districts also specifically assessed LEP students' English proficiency skills because Chapter 1 provided ESL services, and two districts did not assess LEP students' academic achievement. Thus, this element produces mixed results across districts in terms of distinguishing educational deprivation from a lack of English-language proficiency.

Multiple measures for selection. Most districts reported using multiple selection measures and indicated they do so to reduce the chances of making an incorrect placement. In two districts that do not formally require multiple measures, school personnel reported that they occasionally used other information to override the single measure being used. We noted, however, that few districts used much of the large amount of information developed for individual LEP students by language services personnel besides the English-language proficiency score.

Primary language assessment. Only a few of these districts used primary language achievement tests for Chapter 1 basic skills selection, and each of those provided at least some Chapter 1 reading and math services in the primary language. Just one of this subset of districts used primary language tests in languages other than Spanish on a regular basis. As part of LEP

Table 2.8

Adequacy of Districts' Procedures for Selecting LEP Students Into Chapter 1

District	Are the Procedures Able to Distinguish Educational Deprivation from English-Language Deficiency?			Are LEP and English-Proficient Students Selected for Services on the Same Basis?	Are Roughly Proportional Numbers of LEP Students Served in Chapter 1?
	Does the Selection Procedure Focus on Academic Achievement?	Are Multiple Measures Used to Reduce Selection Errors?	Are LEP Students' Achievement Levels Assessed in Their Primary Languages?		
A1	Yes, for Spanish, unclear others	Yes, with test most important	Spanish only	Yes, for Spanish-speakers; not clear for others.	Yes, although at least one school serves a smaller proportion of LEP students.
A2	Yes, but also addresses ESL	Yes, not part of formal procedure	No	This method selects nearly all LEP students, but also includes ESL.	No, much higher proportion LEP. According to school staff, 90 to 95 percent qualify.
A3	Yes, but test is limited in scope	Yes	Yes, but test not normed	It is not clear that tests are equivalent; and local test does not match others or curriculum.	Yes
B1	Yes, but also addresses ESL.	Yes, depending on proficiency	Spanish only	It is not clear that tests and other measures for English and LEP students are equivalent.	Yes
B2	Yes, but only for math	Yes	No	No, because LEPs are not eligible, except for math, until English proficient.	No, less than proportional numbers are served.
C1	No, focused only on ESL	Yes	Only rarely	No, except in a few schools; elsewhere LEP students assessed for ESL.	No, less than proportional numbers are served, but how much less depends on school's decision.
C2	No, LEP students take test in English	Yes	No	LEP not served actively by Chapter 1.	No, much less than proportional. LEPs excluded because district feels language comes first.

Table 2.8 (continued)

District	Are the Procedures Able to Distinguish Educational Deprivation from English-Language Deficiency?			Are LEP and English-Proficient Students Selected for Services on the Same Basis?	Are Roughly Proportional Numbers of LEP Students Served in Chapter 1?
	Does the Selection Procedure Focus on Academic Achievement?	Are Multiple Measures Used to Reduce Selection Errors?	Are LEP Students' Achievement Levels Assessed in Their Primary Languages?		
C3	Yes, but substantial English needed	Not applicable	No	LEP students not selected for Chapter 1 until English proficient.	No, less than proportional. LEPs excluded because district feels language comes first.
D1	Yes, but some English needed	Yes, but test emphasized	No	Not clear, because some English needed but Chapter 1 qualifying standard is liberal.	No, appears to be more than proportional, but the Chapter 1 program is fairly small.
D2	Yes, but some English needed	Yes, but test emphasized	No	LEP students not selected for Chapter 1 until nearing English proficiency.	No, less than proportional, but how much depends on school-level decisions.
E1	Yes, but focus is on ESL	Yes, but test emphasized	No	No, not until LEPs have exited language program.	No, appears to be more than proportional because of extensive, jointly funded ESL.
E2	Yes, but focus is on ESL	Yes	No	No, not until LEPs have exited language program.	No, appears to be more than proportional because of extensive, jointly funded ESL.
F1	Yes, but some English needed	May be used	No	Yes, but only after LEPs have enough English to take a English standardized test.	No, much less than proportional.
F2	Yes, but also addresses ESL	Yes	Yes	Yes, but only after LEPs begin to transition from MEP's ESL to Chapter 1 reading.	Yes, roughly proportional if MEP-funded services are counted with Chapter 1.

identification procedures, however, language services staff in several additional districts used primary language achievement tests (Spanish and other languages) as part of their own skills assessments, but those test data were rarely used by Chapter 1 personnel.

Selection for Chapter 1 Services on the Same Basis

Whether LEP and English-proficient students are selected for Chapter 1 services on the same basis, i.e., the students that are selected share a need for the service that is provided, depends both on the nature of the selection procedures and also on the nature of the services. Making a judgment as to the adequacy of the selection procedures based on this criterion is particularly difficult because the services provided to LEP students in some of the districts differ significantly from those provided to their English-proficient peers.

No ESL-equivalent service is provided to English-proficient students, so comparing procedures for selection into ESL is not relevant in those districts. In other districts, the services are reportedly the same but the language of instruction -- and the language of assessment -- may be different. While we did not directly compare primary language achievement tests with the English-language achievement tests used in the visited districts, district and school personnel frequently suggested that the different tests were not comparable in their content or coverage of the curriculum.

A related problem is that none of the districts had made explicit efforts to compare the measures used to select LEP and English-proficient student to each other or to the objectives of the Chapter 1 instruction. This validation step, which is routinely recommended when local Chapter 1 personnel are selecting new evaluation or selection measures, is just as routinely ignored. Districts did not even ask teachers systematically, as a simple validation exercise, whether the alternative measures being used are indeed measures of the same constructs despite, as observed above, the willingness of teachers to express themselves on the subject.

Proportional Numbers of LEP and English-Proficient Students

Few of the districts we visited appeared to meet the criterion of serving roughly proportional numbers of LEP and English-proficient students in Chapter 1. Our data on this point should be treated with caution, however, because district-level Chapter 1 personnel were frequently only able to guess at the number of LEP students receiving Chapter 1 basic skills services, and district-level language services staff were equally uninformed about LEP students' level of Chapter 1 participation.

Several districts served a much higher proportion of their LEP students than of their English-proficient students in Chapter 1. Personnel in one district suggested this was due to the demographic characteristics of the LEP students, which made them more likely to be educationally deprived, but it was our impression that the selection measures for the two groups of students were significantly different and that these procedural differences led to much of the imbalance.

Districts that set a prior condition of some English-language proficiency for Chapter 1 basic skills generally served smaller proportions of LEP than of English-proficient students. These sequential services districts also frequently employed instructional settings, including bilingual centers, where Chapter 1 was not available, which further reduced the proportion of LEP students being served in Chapter 1.

Only four of the districts appeared to meet this criterion of adequacy. Each provides Chapter 1 basic skills services (or Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program services) in primary language settings. While each also provides some ESL support through Chapter 1, ESL is not their primary focus. Further, all four use primary language testing (Spanish) and one has even developed a test it claims can be translated readily for students from any language group.

Summary of Selection Procedure Adequacy

Based on the three criteria used to judge their adequacy, the procedures used in each of the visited districts fall short. While the districts using primary-language testing met more of the criteria for adequate selection of LEP students for Chapter 1 than other districts, none of the districts met all criteria. At the same time, in nearly all of the visited districts, staff recognized the limitations of their procedures and were interested in finding better procedures and measures. Educators reported a shortage of tools for identifying and assessing LEP students, particularly for LEP students with a primary language other than Spanish.

Procedures in Sequential Services Districts. In districts with a sequential service model, students with little or no English-language proficiency were not assessed for Chapter 1 reading and math services but were sometimes assessed for Chapter 1-funded ESL. Once students reached a pre-determined level of English-language proficiency, making them eligible for Chapter 1 academic services, they were typically selected for Chapter 1 using the same standardized achievement test as English-proficient students. There was an assumption that residual language deficiency did not bias the scores of these LEP students on the standardized English-language achievement test.

Procedures in Simultaneous Services Districts. Staff in districts with primary-language testing and simultaneous services assumed that the primary language tests they used were comparable to the English language achievement tests that determined Chapter 1 selection. It is not clear, however, that Chapter 1 selection procedures that rely on scores from English and Spanish norm-referenced tests result in serving students with the same needs, since differences in the content and structure of the tests are likely to influence the types of students identified. In addition, primary language achievement tests were available only in Spanish.

CHAPTER 3

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES FOR LEP STUDENTS PROVIDED BY CHAPTER 1 AND LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

This chapter describes the instructional services provided to LEP students through Chapter 1 or language programs designed to promote English proficiency. The chapter begins with a description of the Chapter 1 services provided in the 14 districts, followed by a description of language services for LEP students. It concludes with a discussion of service delivery relationships and coordination among programs. Whenever relevant, differences in services offered at schools within districts are described.

Characteristics of Chapter 1 Services for LEP and English-Proficient Students

Chapter 1 services are determined by an annual student needs assessment conducted by each district. In terms of Chapter 1 services for LEP students, the Chapter 1 Policy Manual indicates:

> The purpose of the Chapter 1 program is to remediate children's educational deprivation and not the children's lack of English-language proficiency. An LEA, however, may adjust the instruction to accommodate LEP children, for example, by providing bilingual staff and materials for these children. (p. 65)

In most case study districts, Chapter 1 services did not differ substantially for LEP and English-proficient students in terms of intensity, delivery model, or subject. In some cases the language used to provide Chapter 1 instruction differed, but the curriculum and objectives usually remained the same. The primary exception to this general rule was the provision of Chapter 1 ESL services to LEP students.

As shown in table 3.1, the services offered by Chapter 1 varied across districts by grade, subject, instructional setting, and language of instruction. This section describes the characteristics of services offered by Chapter 1.

Table 3.1

Chapter 1 Services for LEP and English Proficient Students

District	Grades	Subjects	Setting	Language
A1	K-6	Reading Language Arts	In-class Computer Lab School-wide	English Primary
A2	K-8	Language Arts Math ESL	In-class Computer Lab School-wide	English Primary
A3	K-12	Reading Language Arts Math	Pull-out In-class Computer Lab Extended Day Extended Year	English Primary
B1	1-6	Reading Language Arts Math	Pull-out In-class Replacement	English Primary
B2	2-5	Reading Language Arts Math	Computer Lab	English
C1	PK-12	Reading Math ESL	Pull-out Replacement School-wide	English
C2	1-3 9-12	Reading Math	Pull-out	English
C3	1-5	Reading Language Arts	Pull-out	English
D1	1-4	Reading Math	Pull-out In-class	English
D2	K-6	Reading Math	Pull-out In-class Computer Lab Extended Day	English
E1	PK-3	Reading Math ESL PK	In-class Pull-out	English

Table 3.1 (continued)

District	Grades	Subjects	Setting	Language
E2	K-8	Reading Math ESL	Pull-out In-class Computer Lab	English Primary
F1	1-5	Reading Language Arts Math	Pull-out In-class	English Primary
F2	PK-12	Reading Math Pre-K	Pull-out In-class Home-based PK	Migrant-Spanish Basic-English

Chapter 1 Courses

In the visited districts, Chapter 1 services typically provided reading, language arts, and math services. Four districts provided Chapter 1 ESL services. In some of these, ESL aides or teachers were funded jointly by Chapter 1 and local funds, making it difficult to distinguish Chapter 1 from locally funded activities. Especially when services are provided within the regular classroom, this arrangement is viewed by local personnel as allowing the aides to serve LEP students, regardless of their Chapter 1 eligibility.

Chapter 1 Instructional Settings

Most districts used both in-class and pull-out settings, although local personnel often reported that there seemed to be a move away from pull-out toward in-class services. In most districts, instructional aides were used to help with instruction in the regular classroom, while certified teachers staffed the pull-out programs. Six districts also used computer assisted instruction in lab settings staffed by aides. The settings used for Chapter 1 services did not seem to be tied to districts' Chapter 1 selection procedures.

Language of Instruction Used in Chapter 1

Six districts used some primary language instruction in Chapter 1, and a seventh used Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program funds to provide primary language instruction. In some districts, instructional aides or teachers use the student's primary language to review the lesson or instructions that the regular classroom teacher had originally delivered in English. In other districts, Chapter 1 supplemented a bilingual replacement program, so Chapter 1 assistance also was delivered in the student's primary language. Most districts offering primary language instruction in Chapter 1 served large numbers or proportions of LEP students, and, in all but one of these districts, primary

language instruction also was used in the LEP program. These districts tended to use primary language testing or teacher judgment to place students in Chapter 1 programs.

Availability and Characteristics of Non-Chapter 1 Language Services for LEP Students

Availability of Language Services for LEP Students

The rapid growth in the size of the LEP population has raised concerns among policy makers about the adequacy of funds to meet the language needs of LEP students. With this has come an additional concern that, due to limited local funds for LEP programs, districts will turn to Chapter 1. To address this issue more thoroughly, we examined the availability of language services for LEP students across grades and schools within the visited districts.

Language services for LEP students, while usually available in all grades, were concentrated on students in the early primary grades, as were Chapter 1 programs. This is partially due to the fact that most identified LEP students are in the early elementary grades. The early primary grade focus also reflected the views of many local educators that language needs must be dealt with early so the students will not fall too far behind.

Language services for LEP students were not available at all the schools within the districts. Nine districts placed their language services in specific school locations, so LEP students either attended schools that were whole-day language magnets or were bused to specified language centers for part-day services. In some districts, an elementary school housed the language magnet for a single grade, so LEP students wishing to take advantage of continued language services attended a different school each year. Usually, districts placed language services in schools in the neighborhoods where LEP students lived, if space was available in the school. In other districts, particularly when relatively small numbers of LEP students were scattered across a district, services would be concentrated in a few schools to achieve some economies of scale. Desegregation plans in a few districts mandated

implementation of magnets, including magnets serving LEP students. And in a few other districts, some services were concentrated in particular schools because the district's approach to LEP students was to focus intensive efforts on survival English in a non-threatening setting before mainstreaming the students.

In the districts that had language services for LEP students available in every school, the intensity of those services tended to vary from school to school. For example, a transitional bilingual education program (TBE), which represents a highly intense service that typically places a teacher and aide with a comparatively small number of students, might be housed in a few elementary schools while lower intensity ESL services might be provided in others. A LEP student then has the options of either enrolling in the school with TBE services or remaining in the neighborhood school and receiving ESL pull-out services.

Characteristics of Language Services for LEP Students

As shown in table 3.2, language services for LEP students varied across the visited districts in terms of approach, instructional setting, and language of instruction. This section describes the characteristics of those services and offers some explanations for the variation across districts.

Approaches to providing language services for LEP students. We observed five of the six approaches listed below in the visited districts (i.e., "submersion" was not used). These approaches varied according to the amount of primary language used, and the approaches often overlapped within a given district.

- Maintenance Bilingual Education (MBE) offers academic content instruction in the student's primary language with the goal of maintaining a student's primary language skills. The student may receive English language instruction as well as primary language instruction in an attempt to attain fluency in both languages. This approach differs from transitional bilingual education in that the goal is

Table 3.2

Language Services for LEP Students

District	Number LEP Students	Instructional Setting	Approach to Providing Language Service*	Language of Instruction
A1	2,666	Replacement Pull-out In-class	TBE ESL	English Spanish
A2	22,000	Replacement	TBE ESL Structured English	English Primary Language
A3	5,410	Replacement Pull-out In-class	TBE ESL Structured English	English Spanish Vietnamese Portuguese
B1	40,000	Replacement Pull-out	TBE ESL Structured English	English Primary Language
B2	181	Replacement Pull-out	MBE Structured English	English Primary Language
C1	40,000	Replacement Pull-out	TBE ESL Structured English	English Primary Language
C2	181	Replacement Pull-out	MBE Structured English	English Primary Language
C3	688	Replacement	TBE ESL	English Primary Language
D1	113	Pull-out	ESL	English
D2	4,025	Replacement Pull-out In-class	ESL Primary Language Support	English Primary Language
E1	750	Pull-out	Structured English	English
E2	938	In-class Replacement Pull-out	ESL TBE ESL Structured English	Primary English Spanish

Table 3.2 (continued)

District	Number LEP Students	Instructional Setting	Approach to Providing Language Service*	Language of Instruction
F1	3,478	Replacement Pull-out	ESL Primary Language Support	English Primary
F2	1,700	Replacement Pull-out	TBE ESL Primary Language Support	English Spanish

* TBE Transitional Bilingual Education
ESL English as a Second Language
MBE Maintenance Bilingual Education

not to move gradually away from primary language dominance, but to maintain primary language skills while acquiring English-language skills.

- Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) offers English to LEP students as a separate subject, while some or all other content areas are taught in the student's primary language. This continues until the student is proficient enough in English to reduce the amount of primary language instruction and gradually transfer into an all-English classroom. TBE programs are sometimes described as early-exit or late-exit reflecting the rate at which transition from the primary language to English is expected.

- Structured English (sometimes called structured immersion) uses only English, but in all content areas it is tailored to the student's English proficiency level to ensure that students understand the content that is presented. The content becomes the medium for learning English. Although the structured English teacher is frequently able to speak the student's primary language, he/she uses it only to understand questions posed by students in their primary language, with his/her responses in English.

- English as a second language (ESL) is a specially designed curriculum for teaching English to non-native speakers. ESL methods vary tremendously, and the student's primary language may or may not be used. ESL is frequently used as part of TBE programs to support the student who is making the transition to English-only classrooms.

- Primary language support refers to use of a primary language speaker to tutor or translate for a LEP student when necessary. The service is typically provided by a paraprofessional in a pull-out or in-class setting.

- Submersion refers to placement of LEP students in a regular all-English classroom. No special language instruction or other language support is provided. We did not observe submersion being used purposefully as an instructional approach.

The language service approaches offered to LEP students in the visited districts tended to differ by state and number of LEP students served. As evidenced in table 3.2, the districts within certain SEAs clearly favored transitional bilingual education programs, at least for Spanish-speaking students. TBE programs also were more common in the districts with large numbers of LEP students

and districts with a predominant language group. Districts with a small number or proportion of LEP students or with a great many LEP students but no one predominant language typically provided structured English or ESL.

Instructional settings in language services for LEP students. Replacement, pull-out, and in-class settings were used in LEP programs. Particular settings tended to correspond with a specific instructional approach.

TBE approaches, almost by definition, require replacement settings; many of the districts also offered ESL pull-outs for students receiving instruction in a TBE replacement. In addition, many of the districts that served students in the dominant language group in TBE, offered structured English, primary language support, or ESL for students from less common language backgrounds.

Districts frequently provided ESL in a pull-out setting, with the duration of the pull-out depending on student need and scheduling concerns. Although some students were pulled out for as much as 2 hours per day, it was more typical for ESL pull-outs to last 35-45 minutes per day.

Pull-out, in-class, and replacement settings were used for structured English, while primary language support was usually provided in class.

Language of instruction in language services for LEP students. Districts offered language services for LEP students in the primary language and in English. While Spanish was by far the most common primary language used in instruction, services were also provided in Portuguese, Vietnamese and other southeast Asian languages, Polish, and a host of other languages. Primary language instruction was typically found in districts with a large population of students speaking a predominant primary language, but we observed a few instances of primary language instruction in districts with only one student speaking a particular language. For example, one district hired a bilingual Polish-speaking instructional aide to assist a single student through tutoring and primary language support.

The special language services provided in one district illustrates the variety of language services and delivery models that can be available within a particular district.

> This district used a combination of transitional bilingual education, sheltered English, and ESL to serve LEP students. Although the emphasis of primary language instruction in the elementary grades was on reading, math, and language arts, some children received all their subjects in their primary language.
>
> As part of a desegregation plan designed to reduce imbalances due to language and ethnicity, 16 elementary schools were designated as language-specific magnets, or bilingual centers, for Spanish, Vietnamese, or Portuguese.
>
> The district used two basic strategies for organizing the instruction of its LEP students. The bilingual centers were designed as primary language replacement programs. They were geared primarily to students in the early elementary grades but were available to students in all grades. The main method of instruction was transitional bilingual education. Students were transported from their own attendance area to the bilingual center.
>
> The second strategy was the individual learning plan. Individual learning plans were used for LEP students who either were not in a bilingual center or who had parents who did not want their children bused across town to a bilingual center. Students on individual learning plans were generally placed in English-only classrooms in their neighborhood school. Depending on the students' individual learning plans and resources at their schools, they may have received ESL or structured English in an in-class or pull-out setting. In a few cases no language support was provided.

In some ways this district was typical of districts with a large number of LEP students served through TBE. The primary approach to instruction may be TBE, but usually some alternative language services also were in use.

Relationships Between Chapter 1 and Language Services for LEP Students

Service Model

In several districts, the settings, facilities, or design of the Chapter 1 and/or LEP programs made it very difficult for individual students to be served simultaneously by both programs. The following were typical situations: (1) LEP students were placed in a bilingual center that did not offer Chapter 1; (2) Chapter 1 and LEP services were both offered in full-time or nearly full-time

replacement settings; or (3) both programs used pull-outs, and local staff felt multiple pull-outs could be detrimental. Schoolwide projects, on the other hand, appear to have facilitated simultaneous services.

Bilingual centers. The use of newcomer schools or bilingual centers for LEP students frequently precluded providing Chapter 1 services to them. These centers typically focused on teaching survival English and appropriate school behavior to new immigrants, and students remained in the centers from a few months to a year and were then transferred to a regular school. When LEP students transferred into the regular school midway through the year, Chapter 1 testing and selection usually would have already taken place, making the new arrivals ineligible or relegating them to waiting lists. Since students were often in these schools for only a few months, and the schools served all, or large portions, of the district, the bilingual centers were not considered as sites for Chapter 1 by the district. However, according to the Chapter 1 regulations:

> An LEA may identify as eligible a school that ... serves more than one school attendance area ... if the proportion of low-income children in average daily attendance in that school is substantially equal to the proportion of low-income children in an eligible attendance area (34 CFR, §200.30(b)(3)(i)).

Based on our observation of several of the bilingual centers in the visited districts, most if not all of the centers would be eligible for Chapter 1 programs under this provision, as most of the students were from low income backgrounds.

Replacement settings. In replacement settings, LEP students might be housed in a regular school building but receive all of their instruction in a bilingual replacement or structured-English classroom. When both Chapter 1 and the program for LEP students adopted replacement settings, it became almost impossible to provide Chapter 1 and LEP services simultaneously; students cannot be in two places at once. For example:

As part of a site-based management plan implemented in district F1, teachers and administrators had implemented what they called a basic skills block. Students received their basic skills instruction in either the regular block, the Chapter 1 block, the special education block, or the ESL block. Since they received their basic skills instruction only from the designated basic skills block teacher, they could not receive services from more than one of the four basic skills programs.

Pull-outs. In some districts, regular classroom teachers and administrators were reluctant to have students pulled out of the regular class for more than one or sometimes two special programs. They feared the student spent more time in transition than in instruction. Thus, when Chapter 1 and the LEP program both used pull-outs, students might be excluded from one of the two programs. We observed they were more likely to be excluded from Chapter 1 than LEP services because the districts recognized they had a legal obligation under *Lau v. Nichols* to address a student's language proficiency.

School-wide projects. A Chapter 1 service delivery model that can facilitate the service of LEP students in Chapter 1 is the school-wide option available to schools with 75 percent or more of their students from low-income families. Typically, schools adopting the school-wide approach use either instructional aides or certified teachers to reduce the staff:student ratio throughout the school. Since all students can be served, issues of eligibility and service delivery did not arise. In the visited schools using the school-wide project option, all LEP students received Chapter 1 and special language services to the extent each was needed. At the same time, these schools also had very high percentages of LEP students (e.g., 30 percent or more), and they were in districts that had a simultaneous service philosophy and provided services simultaneously, so multiple services may have been provided even in the absence of the school-wide option.

Courses

The courses offered by the Chapter 1 program also had an impact on whether Chapter 1 provided services for LEP students. One district adopted a policy that students could not receive instruction in a given subject from more than one source. Since that district considered ESL the same subject as English reading/language arts, students who received ESL could not get Chapter 1 reading and vice versa. This policy was based on beliefs that addressing a problem (such as the inability to read English) through several different approaches might confuse students rather than help them, and that one individual should be responsible for teaching a particular skill. As stated by one respondent, "We don't want three people teaching reading."

LEP students in several districts could receive Chapter 1 math instruction but not Chapter 1 reading, because math was not seen as replicating ESL instruction. In addition, math, at least at the elementary level, was seen as requiring less English-language skill than reading.

The provision of ESL instruction funded by Chapter 1 clearly links subject matter to the provision of Chapter 1 services to LEP students. Several districts offered Chapter 1 ESL support to LEP students who were either in a bilingual replacement program or who were also receiving ESL services from another source. In a few districts, students might receive a double dose of ESL from two different staff members. More districts, however, did not appear to provide Chapter 1-funded ESL in such a way that Chapter 1-funded ESL was clearly supplementary.

Coordination between Chapter 1 and Language Programs for LEP Students

We pointed out earlier that Chapter 1 and language program staff do not coordinate at the SEA; the same is true in districts. This is the case even though the Chapter 1 Policy Manual states "[t]he LEA must coordinate the Chapter 1 services with the services [to LEP students] required by law" (p. 64). In most districts, programs for LEP students and Chapter 1 function independently and

are not well coordinated. This programmatic independence is reflected in several different sets of problems. One set of problems emerges when Chapter 1 and LEP services both focus on the primary grades. When services are provided sequentially, LEP students are likely to have fewer years of Chapter 1 available. Further, older LEP students, such as teenage immigrants, may have few language services and no Chapter 1 services available. A second set of problems, discussed in the previous sections, arises when one or both programs adopt models of service delivery that effectively preclude students being served by both as, for example, when both use replacement settings.

District F2 provides a positive, but rare example of how Chapter 1 and special language programs can coordinate sequencing of services, subject offerings, and service delivery settings.

> The district makes an effort to determine a student's dominant language, ensures that he/she is reading at grade level in that language, and only then, if the dominant language is Spanish, begins to shift the student from Spanish to English fluency. Because practically all of the LEP students in the district are the children of migratory agricultural workers, the district is able to use migrant education program (MEP) funds in conjunction with Chapter 1 basic and local funds to offer a comprehensive language program.
>
> Students who are in the bilingual classroom and are below grade level in Spanish reading based on the Spanish Woodcock receive supplemental Spanish reading from the migrant program. Once LEP students are ready to transition to English, they move away from Spanish reading and begin receiving English reading support from Chapter 1.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to examine local methods for serving LEP students in Chapter 1. Based on this examination, the U.S. Department of Education's objective was to provide guidance to school districts faced with the need to address the issue. This chapter begins with a summary of our observations about local practices in terms of the central study questions. That is followed by a more general discussion of several additional issues and problems that emerged in this study. The chapter concludes with recommendations on several issues, including procedures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1.

Summary of Major Observations

Selecting LEP Students for Chapter 1

Procedures and criteria. Across the districts, the single most important measure for selecting LEP students into Chapter 1 basic skills was their scores on English-language proficiency tests. Many of the case study districts had established prior conditions that had to be met, such as demonstrating a minimum level of English proficiency or being eligible to move into an English-only classroom before they would consider a student for Chapter 1 basic skills. Comparable prior conditions for English-proficient students were rare.

In several of the districts that set an English-proficiency prerequisite, the standard of English proficiency was set high enough that the student may no longer be considered LEP. Consequently, in districts that set such high qualifying standards, it is questionable whether any currently classified LEP students actually were served in Chapter 1 basic skills. In other cases, to be considered eligible for Chapter 1 basic skills, LEP students would have to demonstrate high levels of proficiency in English

language arts and reading; these levels, in turn, often placed the student near or even above the Chapter 1 selection cut-off scores in those subjects.

The districts that did not impose English-language prerequisites used scores on English-language proficiency tests to determine whether alternative measures would be used to determine Chapter 1 basic skills eligibility for LEP students. Generally, these districts selected LEP students for Chapter 1 basic skills services which were provided in their primary language based on scores on primary language achievement tests or teacher judgments.

Adequacy of selection procedures. We judged the procedures in all of the districts to fall short of meeting the legislative requirement of distinguishing educational deprivation from limited English proficiency. Four districts, however, had implemented procedures that came close to meeting all of the criteria we employed in making those judgments, but even in these districts several problems were noted.

The four districts with procedures that came close to meeting the adequacy criteria shared two characteristics. First, each provided Chapter 1 basic skills and language services simultaneously to students who needed both types of services in one or more subjects. Second, each used one or more forms of primary-language testing as part of the Chapter 1 selection process.

The one criterion of adequacy on which these districts tended to fall short was whether the tests being used for selection were comparable in that they actually assessed the same curricular objectives for students in different language groups. Further, three of these four districts had not established standard Chapter 1 selection procedures for LEP students who were not Spanish-speaking, and the test used for those minority-language LEP students in the fourth district, while established as a

standard procedure, was almost certainly not comparable to either the English-language or Spanish-language tests used for Chapter 1 selection in the district.

Variation in local selection procedures. We looked at state policies, characteristics of the LEP population, and selected aspects of the design of Chapter 1 and language programs. State policies and student characteristics appeared to have some effect on the selection procedures being used, but program design decisions, for Chapter 1 and LEP services, seemed to have the greatest effect across districts on how LEP students were selected for Chapter 1.

We also compared the selection procedures used in schools to the policies set by districts. We expected to find substantial differences across schools within districts, but did not. Indeed, while there were some exceptions, we were struck by the uniformity of Chapter 1 selection procedures across schools within districts.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Districts that implement services sequentially provide Chapter 1 services to only some potentially eligible LEP students. In some districts, the only LEP students who are served are those who need additional help with ESL. Although English reading, math, and language arts services are generally provided in these districts for English-proficient students, LEP students are not eligible for that support while they still have low levels of English-language skills.

Once LEP students reach the level of English-language proficiency required to be considered for Chapter 1 reading, language arts, and math services, they are provided the same services in the same settings as English-proficient students. To reach that point, however, may take several years. This leads to a potential problem because Chapter 1 services tend to be concentrated in the early elementary grades; thus, when students achieve sufficient mastery of English to be considered for academic services from Chapter 1, they may be at a grade level where those services are no longer

available. Further, even if Chapter 1 services are still available, many of the LEP students may have reached a level of proficiency in English reading or language arts that sets them above the Chapter 1 eligibility levels.

In the simultaneous services districts, Chapter 1-eligible LEP students generally receive the same services as their English-proficient peers, but in their primary language. Several of the districts we visited commonly used primary-language instruction and had made extensive efforts to ensure that the primary-language and English-language curricula and materials were similar. It was our observation, however, that much less attention had been paid to whether the assessment tools used to select LEP and English-proficient students for compensatory services also were similar.

Additional Issues and Concerns

Several issues that arose during this study do not fall neatly under a particular study question, and other issues cut across several questions. These issues are discussed in this section.

Non-Spanish-Speaking LEP Students

Many of the observations reported in this study that compare Chapter 1 selection and services for LEP and English-proficient students apply primarily to Spanish-speaking LEP students. This is not surprising since Spanish-speaking students comprise the great majority of LEP students nationwide and even a greater proportion across the districts we visited.

Districts generally coped well in providing language services to non-Spanish-speaking (or minority language, as they will be termed here) LEP students. Frequently, one-on-one tutorials in the primary language or intensive ESL services were provided. A few districts provided services to these students on a regular basis and had set up bilingual centers or other replacement settings to concentrate minority language students so services could be provided more efficiently. Most districts, however,

appeared to address each minority-language situation as a unique event, and devoted extensive time and effort to creating language-service solutions. Unique Chapter 1 solutions, however, were rarely sought; in fact, according to local personnel in several of the districts with just a few minority language LEP students, the students were rarely assessed for any compensatory service needs.

Across nearly all the districts, including those with a handful of minority language LEP children and those with a thousand or more, the extent to which those students actually need compensatory services is largely unknown. Only one of the districts used primary language testing in any language except Spanish, and that test was not comparable to the Spanish- or English-language tests being used. In the other districts, Chapter 1's assessment of the minority language students, when it did occur, frequently involved inventing unique procedures on a student-by-student basis, so it is unlikely that they were consistently adequate to distinguish educational deprivation from English language deficiencies. In short, minority language LEP students continue to constitute a problem of unknown size in terms of Chapter 1 selection and services.

Chapter 1 and ESL Services

In four of the districts, Chapter 1's services to LEP students focused on ESL, while reading, language arts, and math comprised the focus for English-proficient students. LEP students in these districts were restricted from the "basic skills" subjects by requirements that language-proficiency standards had to be met first. It was not clear in these districts that the ESL services funded by Chapter 1, whether funded alone or in combination with another program, were supplementary.

The Hawkins-Stafford Act implies that locally funded ESL services could be supplemented by Chapter 1, much as mathematics or primary language reading can be supplemented. However, we did not observe, nor was it reported to us, that the ESL services funded by Chapter 1 were supporting only the subset of LEP students who were having particular trouble mastering English, i.e., the subject

matter of ESL. We also did not observe any differentiation among the LEP students who were deemed eligible for ESL service that indicated those who had relatively low performance were singled out to receive Chapter 1-funded, supplementary ESL.

Several districts used multiple funding sources (i.e., joint funding) for ESL personnel. In those situations, the students who were having particular problems would be expected to receive extra help at levels that approximated the proportion of supplementary funding provided by Chapter 1. In the districts we visited, however, no evidence was presented to suggest that this was the case, beyond statements such as, "The instructional aides work with all the students who need help."

Information About Chapter 1 Selection Measures and Procedures

Personnel in most of the visited districts had devoted more attention to measures for identifying LEP students than to measures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1. Even where districts had tried to generate appropriate Chapter 1 selection procedures, district and school-level personnel frequently rated them as inadequate, a view we share. We believe it would be useful for the Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Centers, perhaps working with the Multi-cultural Resource Centers, to compare the major Spanish-language achievement tests with several of the more frequently used English-language tests on such topics as construct coverage, norming samples and dates, item difficulties, and their appropriateness as a basis for decisions about individual students (i.e., their reliability).

At the same time, the value of standardized achievement tests is being questioned generally across the country, and states, districts, and other organizations are attempting to develop alternative forms of individual assessment. We would like to encourage developers of alternative assessments to consider the particular assessment problems of LEP students, particularly those speaking languages

other than Spanish. We also strongly encourage validating the alternative measures against commonly used achievement tests.

We further noted that Chapter 1 personnel in many of the districts did not know about all of the information generated for individual LEP students by language services personnel when identifying LEP students and measuring their progress. Some of this information, as will be noted in the concluding section of this chapter, could be combined with other readily available data to improve Chapter 1 selection procedures for LEP students.

Sequential Services

We were not persuaded by local arguments that English language deficiencies must be addressed before problems stemming from educational deprivation can be treated, even though we agreed with many of the specific points raised by local personnel.

We question the premise primarily because of the conventional wisdom that compensatory education provided early can preclude more extensive needs for remediation later on. We also question it for several other reasons. First, in some districts, to delay Chapter 1 is effectively to deny it, because Chapter 1 is concentrated in early grades. Second, in a few districts, the level of English-proficiency prior condition is set so high that to meet it is to be near the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off. Third, even if one were to accept the central premise that language needs must be met first, individual students learn English at different rates (just like any other subject), and some of the slower learners may benefit by getting *supplementary* help in learning English.

Recommendations

Our conclusions, as summarized in the previous few pages, have led us to develop recommendations in the broad areas of providing Chapter 1 services to LEP students and determining

the eligibility of those students for Chapter 1. This section presents those recommendations, beginning first with several recommendations concerning Chapter 1 services to LEP students.

Chapter 1-Funded ESL

P.L. 100-297 appears to permit Chapter 1-funded ESL services just as it does reading or mathematics services, if those services are provided to LEP students whose needs result from educational deprivation and not solely from lack of English-language proficiency. At the same time, P.L. 100-297 does *not* grant districts any special dispensation to ignore Chapter 1's "supplement, not supplant" requirements. The ESL services we observed, whether delivered by staff funded through several programs including Chapter 1 or only by Chapter 1, were not clearly supplementing basic services funded by other sources. On this same point, *Lau v. Nichols* places the burden on local or state funds to meet the basic language needs of LEP students. The ESL services we observed that were funded at least partially by Chapter 1 also did not appear to meet this test; rather, Chapter 1 was treated no differently from state or local funds. As a result of these observations, we recommend that:

- Guidance provided to districts should specifically note that Chapter 1 can provide ESL services, but those services must be clearly in support of ESL services funded by other sources and must be clearly supplementing other ESL services for the students who receive them.

- Districts that use Chapter 1 funds to support ESL must justify that their selection procedures place LEP students in these ESL services on a basis other than a lack of English language proficiency.

Chapter 1 Services to Minority-language LEP Students

We appreciate the difficulties faced by school districts in responding to the needs posed by individuals or groups of children with special needs. In our visits we were often impressed by the care, dedication, and creativity of local personnel in trying to deal with competing demands for relatively declining resources. Nonetheless, we felt that minority-language LEP students, i.e., those who spoke a primary language other than Spanish, were sometimes invisible to Chapter 1 personnel.

This invisibility appears to be partially a function of the problems district and school personnel have in assessing and meeting the needs of these children. To address these problems, improved means of assessing needs of individual students efficiently would be useful, and teachers and other staff may require additional training to serve the unique needs of these students.

- The U.S. Department of Education should encourage development of assessment tools that can be easily translated for use with minority-language LEP students to determine comparable, language-independent, basic skills needs.

- Staff training should be provided by state or local agencies to enhance the ability of Chapter 1 personnel to meet the basis skills needs of language-minority LEP students for whom bilingual instruction is impractical.

Coordination Among Local Programs

We are concerned about the LEP students who will eventually exit LEP services and find that other programs or services they may need, such as Chapter 1, are not available at their grade levels. We also are concerned about older children, particularly recent immigrants with little formal schooling, who find themselves in districts where supplementary language and compensatory education assistance are for primary school students. As noted earlier, according to the Chapter 1 regulations, Chapter 1 services are supposed to "provide maximum coordination" with LEP services required by federal, state, or local law (§200.20(a)(10)(i)(E)). While merely coordinating services enough to take such factors into account will not be enough to solve these problems, without at least that step, any additional steps will be unlikely.

- Chapter 1 administrators should be required to provide assurances in their applications that service patterns and models have been designed in coordination with administrators from other categorical programs as well as the regular education program.

Responsibilities of the SEAs

The effort expended by Chapter 1 offices within the SEAs in the general area of services to LEP students ranged from extensive to negligible. When their SEA's effort was extensive, district personnel appeared to be more aware of the requirements of P.L. 100-297 and Title VI and to be more concerned about implementing their programs appropriately. Although several other factors were also related to local implementation, spurring SEAs to be more active may make major differences, particularly in the states where LEP students are relatively uncommon and districts have little experience.

- State Chapter 1 directors should be required to provide assurances that (1) the requirements are disseminated to local projects, (2) the SEA's monitoring includes appropriate provisions to assess whether the requirements are being met, and (3) the state office is prepared to assist districts who have difficulty meeting the requirements.

Recommended Procedures for Assessing the Educational Needs of LEP Students for Chapter 1

Since no single district's procedures for selecting LEP students for Chapter 1 fully met all of the criteria of adequacy, we cannot recommend widespread use of those we observed. But we did note that data were available in many districts that could be used along with or instead of the selection measures being used now, and that doing so would improve the adequacy of the Chapter 1 selection procedures.

A composite measure may be the best approach. We suggest developing a composite measure of student need that would include elements from among the categories listed in table 4.1. While not all of these data will be available in each district, at least one element of information on educational history, test scores or informal assessments, and teacher judgment should be available for assessing LEP students. The remainder of this section discusses each of the recommended measures and reasons for their inclusion as well as reasons for the exclusion of other commonly used measures

Table 4.1

Data Elements for a Composite Measure to Assess the Educational Needs of LEP Students

Educational History

- Years of schooling compared to other students of the same age;
- Low grades in basic skills subjects on past report cards; and
- Results of parent interviews on student's educational history.

Test Scores and Informal Assessments

- English-language skills compared to other LEP students in U.S. schools for similar duration;
- Scores on primary language achievement tests;
- Rating of student's primary-language skills based on primary-language interview or writing sample; and
- Rating of student's skills in math computation and concepts based on criterion referenced tests given with primary language support.

Teacher Judgment

- Regular classroom teacher's rating of students need; and
- ESL/Bilingual education teacher's rating of student need.

Years of schooling compared to other students of the same age. Several case study districts described students arriving in the U.S. from, for example, rural Mexico at the age of 12 having never attended school. Yet districts' procedures tend to ignore this type of valuable information in assessing a student's need for Chapter 1. Even in selecting first graders for Chapter 1,

completion or non-completion of a kindergarten program may serve as an indicator of the student's level of relative education deprivation. Therefore, by comparing a student's number of years of formal education with other students of the same age, districts may learn something about a student's need for Chapter 1 services.

Low grades in basic skills subjects on past report cards. Teachers conduct formal assessments of a student's academic progress each time they enter a grade on a report card. While some of a LEP student's grades in an all-English classroom may be suppressed due to a language deficiency, consistently poor grades in a particular basic skills subject may be an indication of educational deprivation and a need for additional help.

Results of parent interviews on student's educational history. If districts have staff or volunteers available to interview parents about their student's educational experiences, this information can be valuable in identifying LEP student's need for assistance. For example, if a parent indicates that the student received all As in their home school, this may indicate that the student is not likely to require Chapter 1 assistance.

English-language skills compared to other LEP students in U.S. schools for similar duration. Several teachers indicated that one of the ways they can distinguish which LEP students are language deficient and which ones are educationally deprived is the rate at which they acquire English-language skills. By comparing the rate of language acquisition for students who have been in U.S. schools for a similar duration and who are of similar ages and language backgrounds, educators can assess whether a student has a language deficiency or may also have other learning problems.

Scores on primary-language achievement tests. When primary-language achievement tests are available, they may be useful in assessing the extent of a student's educational deprivation. Because these tests may not be directly validated with the comparable English-language achievement

tests used for Chapter 1 selection, they would probably not meet all of the adequacy criteria described in the previous chapter when used alone; however, as one of several measures of educational need, they may be invaluable.

Rating of student's primary-language skills based on primary-language interview or writing sample. Many of the local language services staff we met with indicated that, by interviewing students in their primary language, they were able to determine whether the student could speak his/her primary language properly. They found this a valuable tool in assessing a student's educational status. This practice can be expanded to include writing samples or short reading passages to determine if the students are literate in their primary language. These data are already frequently available from language services personnel at the district and school level.

Rating of student's skills in math computation and concepts based on criterion-referenced tests given with primary-language support. To assess a student's need for math assistance, performance on criterion referenced tests may be used. It is important, moreover, for students with very little English and/or for tests of math concepts rather than computation, to offer primary-language support during testing. The test administrator may then explain the instructions to the students in their primary language and translate any additional terms.

Regular classroom teacher's rating of students needs and ESL/bilingual education teacher's rating of student need. Classroom teachers, for the most part, felt confident that they could distinguish between language deficiency and educational deprivation. Districts that do not feel comfortable with unstructured forms of teacher judgment may choose to develop checklists (as in district A2) or other more systematic procedures for using teacher judgment in Chapter 1 selection.

Prototypes. Below are two prototypes of Chapter 1 selection procedures that make use of elements from the above-mentioned categories. In the first example, the LEP students come from

many different language backgrounds, no primary language tests are available, and the district does not employ bilingual staff. In the second example, LEP students are mostly Spanish speaking, primary language achievement tests are available, and the district employs bilingual staff.

Example 1. This is a small district with a LEP population primarily composed of Southeast Asian students. The district has a Chapter 1 reading and math program for students in grades 2-6 with Chapter 1 services provided in a pull-out setting. None of the Chapter 1 teachers is bilingual or trained in ESL techniques. The district offers locally funded ESL pull-out services to LEP students.

The district has developed a composite score to select LEP students for Chapter 1. English-proficient students are selected based on their scores on the total reading or total math battery of the CAT. Students who score below the 40th percentile are eligible for Chapter 1 if their classroom teacher agrees that the score accurately reflects the student's classroom performance. In previous years, the district informally validated the composite score cut-off for selecting LEP students as being similar to the CAT percentile ranks cut-off by interviewing classroom teachers who had LEP and English-proficient students.

The district's composite score for selecting LEP students includes teacher judgments, educational history, and informal assessments. The ESL teacher and the regular classroom teacher rate the LEP student's level of need for Chapter 1 reading or math services on a scale of 1-5, with 5 representing the greatest need. If the two teachers' rankings differ by more than 1, a conference is held with the Chapter 1 administrator or teacher, the ESL teacher, and the regular classroom teacher to discuss their perceptions of the student's needs and the rationale behind their ratings and to agree upon a rating. Report cards from the previous quarter are also examined. Teachers count the number of Ds and Fs the student received and enter the total on the student selection form. As a final component, scores on English-language proficiency tests are compared with scores for other students who have

been in U.S. schools for a similar duration. If the student is particularly slow in acquiring English-language skills, an additional point is added to the composite score on the student referral form. Students with scores over eight are eligible for Chapter 1, with students served in order of highest scores first.

ASSESSMENT OF LEP STUDENT'S NEED FOR CHAPTER 1 READING

Points:

- Regular Classroom Teacher Rating (1-5)
- ESL Teacher Rating (1-5)
- Number of Ds or Fs on Last Report Card
- Delay in English Language Acquisition

Example 2. This is a large urban district with a large, predominantly Spanish-speaking LEP population. The Chapter 1 program offers reading, math, and ESL pull-out services to students in grades K-5. The program for LEP students includes ESL pull-outs, a Spanish TBE replacement program and, for minority language LEP students, primary language tutorials and structured English. Many of the Chapter 1 teachers speak Spanish, and instructional assistants who speak other languages are hired on a part-time basis when needed.

When students enroll in the district, they are sent to a central intake center that collects information about their educational history, assesses their oral and written English-language proficiency, and determines their needs for special services. The central intake center has employees who speak a wide range of languages so LEP parents are interviewed. English-proficient students who do not have recent standardized norm-referenced test scores on a list of state-approved tests are

administered the Gates-McGinitie reading test and a math computation criterion-referenced test tied to the district's curriculum.

As part of this initial assessment, LEP students have an oral interview with a primary language speaker from the enrollment center and a writing sample in the student's primary language (for students in grades 2 and higher). Spanish-speaking students are given the SABE reading test, while non-Spanish speaking LEP students are given a teacher-developed primary-language reading comprehension test and the same math computation criterion-referenced test used for English-proficient students. District personnel claim the primary language reading test battery is based directly on the district's learner outcomes at each grade level, but the claim has not been formally validated. The district has not attempted to cross-validate the SABE, the Gates-McGinitie, or the teacher-developed reading tests; however, district personnel reported that the technical manuals for the standardized tests suggested many of the same constructs were covered.

Newly enrolled English-speaking students who score below the 36th percentile on the Gates are automatically eligible for Chapter 1 reading. Similarly, new Spanish-speaking students with little or no English are eligible for Chapter 1 Spanish reading if they score below the 36th percentile on the SABE. (Students who score below the 20th percentile on either test or who have major discrepancies between subtest scores are referred to special education for additional diagnostics testing.) Whether services are actually provided also depends on the judgments of the central intake assessors that the test scores appear to reflect the students' educational histories accurately. Students with scores between the 35th and 50th percentile, as well as any students who scored below the 36th percentile but were not served, are to be observed by the classroom or reading teacher and may be recommended for Chapter 1 at any time.

If newly enrolled minority language LEP students are unable to meet the district's reading standards for 80 percent of the objectives on the reading criterion-referenced test and they are receiving primary-language tutorials, they are eligible for Chapter 1 primary-language reading support. As with other students, to be served their test performance also must be judged to be representative of their past performance. If they are not served or if their scores are "borderline" above the standards, they are to be observed by the classroom teacher and the primary-language tutor and can be recommended for Chapter 1.

No newly enrolled LEP students can be recommended for Chapter 1 ESL.

For mathematics, the same criterion-referenced computation skills test is administered to all newly enrolled students by grade regardless of their language status. Students who do not pass the standards for 80 percent of the objectives for a grade are eligible for Chapter 1 math support. As with other students, to be served their test performance also must be judged to be representative of their past performance. If they are not served or if their scores are "borderline" above the standards, they are to be observed by the classroom teacher and can be recommended for Chapter 1.

The district administers the Gates, SABE, and the criterion-referenced tests to all elementary students each spring. Students who fall below the cutoffs described above for new enrollees are provisionally eligible for Chapter 1 reading or math as appropriate. In addition, all students who are in danger of retention or who are judged by their teachers as being at risk (using a district-designed checklist of at-risk student behavior and home-life predictors) are also provisionally eligible. The school-level student assessment committee then meets to make recommendations for the subsequent year's placement for each student identified potentially eligible by the test or teacher checklist. The district has instructed the schools to give greater weight to the test scores.

Chapter 1 ESL selection is quite different, and only a few students are selected each year. To be selected, the LEP student also must be receiving district-funded ESL and must have been doing so for at least the past two years. In addition, the student must be making significantly slower-than-average progress in mastering English than other students who had comparable levels of English upon their enrollment, as measured by the language services staff during their semi-annual progress assessments. Third, the student must be recommended by the ESL instructor. Students who meet those criteria are automatically placed in a second period of ESL funded by Chapter 1. These "double-dose" ESL students' progress is to be reassessed at least quarterly by language services staff.

Summary of recommended selection procedures. We do not recommend the use of English-language achievement tests for LEP students because little information is available on the impact of language deficits on those test scores and how long that impact lasts. We recommend that districts select LEP students for Chapter 1 using combinations of these alternative methods until those students are judged to be fluent in English, as determined by their scores on English-language-proficiency tests and as demonstrated in their classroom performance.

APPENDIX A

CASE STUDY REPORTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A

District	Page
District A1	A-5
District A2	A-13
District A3	A-21
District B1	A-29
District B2	A-35
District C1	A-41
District C2	A-49
District C3	A-53
District D1	A-59
District D2	A-63
District E1	A-69
District E2	A-75
District F1	A-79
District F2	A-85

Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in the Case Study Reports

• AFDC	Aid for Families with Dependent Children
• BINL	Basic Inventory of Natural Language
• BSM	Bilingual Syntax Measure
• Carrow	Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language
• CAT	California Achievement Test
• CTBS/U	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
• ESL	English as a Second Language
• FLA	Functional Language Assessment
• GINN	Ginn Reading Test
• ILP	Individual Learning Plan
• IPT	IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test
• ITBS	Iowa Test of Basic Skills
• LAB	Language Assessment Battery
• LAMS	Language Assessment Management System
• LAS	Language Assessment Survey
• La Prueba	La Prueba Riverside de Realizacion en Espanol
• LEA	Local Education Agency
• LEP	Limited English Proficient
• Maculaitis	Maculaitis Assessment Program
• MAT	Metropolitan Achievement Test
• MEP	Migrant Education Program
• Moreno	Moreno Oral English Proficiency Test
• NCE	Normal Curve Equivalent
• Nelson	Nelson Reading Test
• NEP	Non-English Proficient
• PK	Pre-kindergarten
• PPVT	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
• Pre-LAS	Pre-Language Assessment Survey
• SAT	Stanford Achievement Test
• SABE	Spanish Assessment for Basic Education
• SCE	State Compensatory Education
• SEA	State Education Agency
• SLEP	Secondary Level English Proficiency
• SPLIT	Shutt Primary Language Indicators Test
• SRA	Science Research Associates
• TALS	Test of Awareness of Language Segments
• TBE	Transitional Bilingual Education
• TESOL	Teachers of English to Students of Other Languages
• WRAT	Wide Range Achievement Test

DISTRICT A1

Introduction

This urban district, located in one of the nation's fastest growing counties, contains a few pockets of middle class neighborhoods amidst expanses of low-income housing. The district is one of 49 in its county, some of which are quite wealthy but most of which are not. The district is operating under a court-ordered desegregation plan that has led to the creation of magnet programs at two large, primarily Hispanic elementary schools -- one magnet emphasizes computers and the other has an extensive arts program. While successful in attracting non-Hispanic students to those schools, pressures within the district are leading to creation of paired magnet schools in non-Hispanic neighborhoods to attract Hispanic students to those areas.

The district operates 26 K-6 elementary schools and six grade 7-8 junior high schools. Four schools include pre-Kindergarten programs, and 11 schools (eight elementary, three junior high) include bilingual centers. The district's K-6 public school membership for 1989-90 was 19,297.

Chapter 1 serves approximately 7,700 students in grades K-6 with assistance in reading, higher-level thinking skills, and in speaking and writing standard English. Eighteen of the public elementary schools have Chapter 1 projects. The state also funds a compensatory education program that serves about 5,500 additional students in grades K-6.

In 1988, there were 2,125 identified LEP students in the district. That number grew to 2,540 in 1989, and stood at 2,666 in 1990. In this period, the district's enrollment as a whole stayed fairly constant.

LEP students speak 19 different primary languages. Of the 2,666 LEP students, the overwhelming majority, 94 percent, had Spanish as their primary language. For all but about 1 percent of the balance, 2 percent spoke Cambodian, 2 percent Lao, and 1 percent Arabic.

About 13,000 students (55 percent) in the district qualify for free or reduced-price lunches. Across elementary schools, the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-priced

lunches ranges from 21 percent to 99 percent; 12 elementary schools have 75 percent or more students who qualify, which makes their schools eligible for the Chapter 1 school-wide project option.

As a measure of overall educational deprivation in the district, on the 1989 California Achievement Test administered district-wide, only kindergarten children had an average Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) score above 50 for reading; for grades 1-6, the reading NCEs ranged from 43 to 45. Math scores were somewhat better; in grade 1, the average NCE was 54, and the NCEs for the other grades were around 50. However, scores for LEP students are **not** included in those averages. Spanish-speakers take another test, and other LEP students are excluded from testing altogether.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA has published several policy statements related to identification of LEP students. With one of the largest numbers and percentages of LEP students in the country and faced with a large number of often very small school districts, the SEA has taken a leading role.

All students are required to have a home language survey signed by parents on file. Each student with a language other than English on the home language survey is to be assessed within 30 days of enrollment. The **oral** English proficiency of students whose parents report any language but English on the home language survey is to be assessed with a state-designated instrument. State approved tests for speaking and comprehension include: BINL (K-12); BSM I/II (K-12); IPT I/II (K-12); LAS I/II, forms A and B, and the short form (K-12); Pre-LAS (ages 4-6); and QSE (K-6). An English **reading and writing** skills assessment is required for students in grades 3 and above who are rated as LEP on their oral skills alone; districts can also require reading and writing assessments for students in lower grades. It is up to districts to establish a process for assessing reading and writing skills.

Students in grades K-2 are considered to be English proficient if they score fluent on oral assessment, unless they score below district-established standards on optional (at these grades) reading or writing assessments. For grades 3-12, students are considered to be English

proficient if they are rated as fluent on oral assessment and are above the district's reading and writing standards.

The state issued an official program advisory in 1988 regarding selection of LEP students for Chapter 1. The program advisory for the most part restates federal law that assessment for Chapter 1 must be based on academic performance, not English language deficiencies. The SEA recommends native language testing, examination of academic history, observation, and other informal assessment methods. In addition, the SEA points out that Chapter 1 can supplement the ESL or other language services the student is already receiving if the student is not making progress.

The SEA uses a consolidated compliance review in which several specially funded programs are monitored, including Chapter 1, State Compensatory Education (SCE), and State programs for LEP students. For Chapter 1 and SCE, monitors address the following relevant points:

- Each participant's needs have been consistently identified annually and assessed with objective educational criteria established by the district.
- Documentation for public school participants is on file at each site.
- Chapter 1 funds are used to provide supplemental educational services to LEP and/or handicapped students when they meet the criteria for Chapter 1 participation.

For state programs for LEP students, the monitors review that the district has properly identified, assessed, and reported all students who have a primary language other than English and are LEP. They also review whether there are adequate basic and supplemental resources to provide each LEP student with bilingual learning opportunities in an appropriate program to sustain academic achievement and that the provision of these services is not contingent upon receipt of state or federal categorical aid funds.

Coordination between the SEA offices administering programs for LEP students and Chapter 1 appears to be limited; for the most part, the Chapter 1 office has left questions about services to LEP students up to the bilingual office. While noting the issues, the Chapter 1 office

believes they are essentially local compliance concerns and they can deal with outstanding problems during monitoring visits rather than having to specify details in advance.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. For initial identification of language minorities, every student is to have on file the results of a home language survey. If the home language survey indicates any language other than English as primary, then the student is given the LAS levels I or II. For students in grades K-2, a score of one, two, or three on the LAS qualifies a student as LEP; a score of four or five on the LAS designates full English proficiency. Students in grades 3-6 who score one, two, or three on LAS are labeled as LEP and offered bilingual services. If students are rated four or five on the LAS, then the district looks at their CAT scores. If CAT test scores are below the 36th percentile on any subscale, then the students are labeled LEP and offered bilingual services. If the students score at the 36th percentile or above, they are labeled English proficient.

A student may be reclassified from LEP to English proficient who: (1) receives a rating of four or five by the teacher using the student oral language observation matrix; (2) receives grades of C or better for three quarters in reading, language arts, and math and has skills, as rated by the classroom teacher, comparable to those of English speakers; (3) scores a four or five on the LAS; (4) produces a writing sample comparable in performance to English speakers (grades 3-6); (5) scores in the 36th percentile or higher on the CAT in reading, math, language arts; and (6) has parental approval for reclassification.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. To be eligible for Chapter 1, a student in a project school must score at the 49th percentile or lower on the CAT or La Prueba's total reading or total mathematics tests. These tests are administered in spring to students in grades 1-6. If a student is new to the district or has no CAT score, a score in the 49th percentile or lower in total reading or total mathematics on La Prueba, for Spanish speakers, or the WRAT, for English speakers, can be used to determine eligibility. Students who speak languages other than Spanish or English are given English tests or, if there is a statement from the child's teacher that the child cannot take an English test, teacher judgment is used to determine Chapter 1 eligibility.

At each of the schools, staff reported that a few borderline students were served or not, despite the WRAT or La Prueba test results, because the teachers felt the tests did not

accurately reflect the students' achievement. There were also concerns among school staff that the different tests were not measuring the same points. The WRAT, in particular, was seen as testing objectives that were not particularly relevant to the curriculum. While La Prueba was seen as a better curriculum match than the WRAT, it and even the CAT were seen as not matching the curriculum as well as desired. Regardless of these doubts, the personnel at these schools indicated they follow district procedure for Chapter 1 selection in most cases, and that district procedures were followed in all cases where selection was based on a CAT score.

Up through 1988, the district automatically identified LEP students as being eligible for Chapter 1. The 1988 state program advisory discussed above led to revising Chapter 1 selection procedures for LEP students and assessing the needs of LEP students as individuals rather than as a group.

The Chapter 1 Program

Of the 26 public elementary schools in the district, 18 have Chapter 1 programs. Most of the schools with qualifying levels of poverty in their attendance areas (i.e., 75% or more on free or reduced-price lunch) have adopted a Chapter 1 school-wide project.

Typically, supplementary instructional services are provided by aides assigned to individual teachers in an in-class setting. The Chapter 1 program stresses reading, higher-level thinking skills, and speaking and writing standard English. Instructional aides are assigned to individual teachers in regular or bilingual replacement classes and work three to six hours per day depending on the number of eligible students in the class. The aides work with individual students or small groups on teacher-directed tasks. In most schools, aides provide supplemental services in the student's primary language when necessary.

Several of the schools, including two visited for this study, have computer labs. Although the labs were not established specifically for Chapter 1, they are used by Chapter 1 students for basic skills drill and practice. The Chapter 1 program in the visited schools emphasizes student motivation and self-esteem as well as academic growth.

Programs for LEP Students

LEP services are provided in all grades, PK-8. Generally services are more concentrated in the earlier elementary grades, because the district's emphasis is on having students move into regular classrooms in about three years. Still, because of the new students who have been coming to the district and because not all LEP students make the transition in three years, LEP services are needed at all grade levels.

The district uses two basic approaches for organizing the instruction of its LEP students. Bilingual centers in eight of the elementary schools are designed as replacement programs in Spanish, geared primarily to students in the early elementary grades but available to students in all grades. The primary method is transitional bilingual education. The bilingual classrooms are a full replacement of the regular English classroom for Spanish-speaking students, offering the same curriculum with parallel primary-language materials. Students are transported from their own attendance areas to the bilingual centers. All bilingual center schools also provide Chapter 1 services.

The second approach is the individual learning plan (ILP). ILPs are used for LEP students who speak a primary language other than Spanish, have Spanish as a primary-language and parents who do not want them in a bilingual classroom, or who have too much English proficiency to require bilingual services but not enough to survive in an English-only classroom. ILP students may receive services in several different ways, depending on the needs of the students and the school's resources. Services may include pull-out from the regular classroom to work with an ESL aide; individual bilingual instruction by a teacher, tutor, or instructional team; or use of primary-language instructional materials.

The LEA has had a formal board policy since 1977 that it has a "responsibility to provide non-English speaking and limited-English speaking students...an educational program which would aid in the development of their individual talents, needs, aspirations, and an appreciation of their cultural background."

Chapter 1 Services for LEP Students

The district provides the same or similar Chapter 1 services to all identified students regardless of language status. Spanish-speakers receive Chapter 1 supplementary instruction in math, reading, or language arts in a bilingual setting at the beginning, usually in the early grades. As their English improves, they receive more of their basic skills instruction in English. For non-Spanish LEP students, Chapter 1 instruction is in supported English with a strong ESL component--the numbers of these children are small.

However, in one school (a non-school-wide project school), LEP children in bilingual classrooms did not receive Chapter 1 instructional services, regardless of their need and eligibility, while ILP LEP students did receive those services. School staff explained this by saying their resources were limited and they had to determine who would be likely to benefit most from the instruction; they also pointed out they were short on qualified staff and that they did provide the same Chapter 1-funded supporting services to LEP and English-proficient students.

DISTRICT A2

Introduction

This large, urban, poor district faces all of the problems common to such districts and additional problems caused by rapid growth, a high proportion of LEP students, and very high mobility rates, particularly among the Hispanic population. For several schools, the student turnover rate for the year is greater than 100 percent, and in one visited school, the rate was reported to be about 150 percent.

Approximately 150 schools in the district serve 116,000 K-12 students. Of the 108 elementary schools, 37 have Chapter 1 programs; another 14 schools have state-funded compensatory education (SCE) programs, and most also have state-funded innovative projects. Of the Chapter 1 schools, 22 are school-wide projects. Out of about 70,000 elementary school students, 19,000 are served in Chapter 1 and over 6,000 are served in SCE.

There are approximately 22,000 LEP students in the district (about 19 percent). Spanish is the predominant language (about 12,000 students). Southeast Asian languages are primary for over 7,000 students, and the additional 3,000 LEP students represent various other language backgrounds.

The district currently has eight newcomer centers to serve recent immigrants -- three high schools, two junior high schools, and three elementary schools. The newcomers centers are housed within school buildings with large numbers of LEP students. Students are assigned to these centers for short periods, seldom more than a few months, to learn survival English and appropriate school behavior. The district believes the secondary school centers are particularly important because it is receiving up to 1,000 secondary students each year who have little or no English proficiency and often little formal schooling.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The State Education Agency (SEA) has published several policy statements related to identification of LEP students. With one of the largest numbers and percentages of LEP students in the country and faced with a large number of often very small school districts, the SEA has taken a leading role.

All students are required to have a home language survey signed by parents on file. Each student with a language other than English on the home language survey is to be assessed within 30 days of enrollment. The **oral** English proficiency of students whose parents report any language but English on the home language survey is to be assessed with a state-designated instrument. State approved tests for speaking and comprehension include: BINL (K-12); BSM I/II (K-12); IPT I/II (K-12); LAS I/II, forms A and B, and the short form (K-12); and Pre-LAS (ages 4-6); QSE (K-6). An English **reading and writing** skills assessment is required for students in grades 3 and above who are rated as LEP on their oral skills alone; districts can also require reading and writing assessments for lower grades. It is up to districts to establish a process for assessing reading and writing skills.

Students in grades K-2 are considered to be English proficient if scoring fluent on oral assessment unless they score below district-established standards on the optional (at these grades) reading or writing assessments. For grades 3-12, students are considered to be English proficient if they are rated as fluent on oral assessment and score above the district's reading and writing standards.

The state issued an official program advisory in 1988 regarding selection of LEP students for Chapter 1. The program advisory restates federal law that assessment for Chapter 1 must be based on academic performance, not English language deficiencies. The SEA recommends native language testing, examination of academic history, observation, and other informal methods of assessment. In addition, the SEA points out that Chapter 1 can supplement the ESL or other language services the student is already receiving if the student is not making progress.

The SEA uses a consolidated compliance review in which several specially funded programs are monitored together, including Chapter 1, SCE, and state programs for LEP students. For Chapter 1 and SCE, monitors address the following relevant points:

- Each participant's needs have been consistently identified annually and assessed with objective educational criteria established by the district.
- Documentation for public school participants is on file at each site.
- Chapter 1 funds are used to provide supplemental educational services to LEP and/or handicapped students when they meet the criteria for Chapter 1 participation.

For the state programs for LEP students, the monitors review that the district has properly identified, assessed, and reported all students who have a primary language other than English and are LEP. They also review whether there are adequate basic and supplemental resources to provide each LEP student with bilingual learning opportunities in an appropriate program to sustain academic achievement and that the provision of these services is not contingent upon receipt of state or federal categorical aid funds.

Coordination between the SEA offices administering programs for LEP students and Chapter 1 appears to be limited; for the most part, the Chapter 1 office has left questions about services to LEP students up to the bilingual office. While noting the issues, the Chapter 1 office believes they are essentially local compliance concerns and they can deal with outstanding problems during monitoring visits rather than having to specify details in advance.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. Identification procedures follow state guidelines closely. Each student is to have a home language survey on file. If a language other than English is specified, then the student's oral English-language proficiency is assessed using the IPT. (Students from a Spanish-language background who are not fluent in English are given the Spanish version of the IPT to determine their level of primary language fluency.) In addition, students who are rated as English-proficient on the IPT have their reading and writing proficiencies assessed in grades 3 and higher using CTBS/U or, in a few cases, La Prueba. Although the district has 10,000 non-Spanish speaking LEP students, it does not use primary language tests to assess them.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Chapter 1 selection is based primarily on standardized achievement test scores. Each spring English-proficient students take the CTBS/U. Scores in the 49th percentile or lower on reading or math determine eligibility for Chapter 1 services. Beginning in 1991-92, the district will change to an abbreviated form of the Stanford Achievement Test, which it believes matches the curriculum better. For kindergartners, a locally developed checklist that includes reading and math skills keyed to the district's curriculum is used instead of a standardized test.

Students who are new to the district and who are fluent in English are given the CTBS/U in Chapter 1 schools if they do not have a recent, comparable test score.

Until 1988-89, the district had automatically identified all LEP students as eligible for Chapter 1 if they attended a Chapter 1 school. This practice was based on the assumption that a lack of English-language proficiency was evidence of a substantial educational disadvantagement. When told by the U.S. Department of Education that such a universal determination of eligibility on language was inappropriate, the district looked for alternatives to identify the educationally disadvantaged among the LEP students.

District staff do not feel any of the currently available achievement tests in Spanish are comparable enough to the CTBS/U, the test used for students who are fluent in English, to be valid in determining Chapter 1 eligibility. La Prueba is administered to Spanish-speaking students in bilingual education classrooms but the results are not used for Chapter 1 selection or assessment. In addition, no tests were considered appropriate for the 40 percent of the district's LEP students who speak a language other than Spanish. As a result, the district developed a teacher checklist for determining the eligibility of LEP students for Chapter 1 or SCE.

The teacher checklist is to be filled out at least annually for all students who are judged to have insufficient English proficiency to be tested in English and who have been formally identified as LEP. The most recent version of the checklist, which was still being reviewed internally and externally at the time of the site visit, asks four questions about each student. The

teacher notes agreement or disagreement with the statement separately for the student's reading and math skills. The four statements are:

- Considering the age of the student, the current recommended instructional placement is below the grade level normally recommended for children of the same age (i.e., the student is "over age" for the recommended placement).
- The student (including a student on waiver) [i.e., a student whose parents would not approve bilingual instruction] is receiving instruction in the English language and is not progressing satisfactorily and/or is working below grade level.
- The student is receiving instruction in the primary language and is not progressing satisfactorily and/or is below grade level.
- The student is receiving ELEPS (English for LEP Students) [the district's ESL program] instruction and is not progressing satisfactorily and/or is working below grade level.

Agreement with any one statement identifies the child as eligible for Chapter 1 assistance in reading, math, or both as appropriate.

Principals and staff in the visited schools reported that 90-95 percent of LEP students would probably be identified as eligible for Chapter 1 in their schools using this checklist. While lower than the 100 percent who were automatically determined to be eligible prior to the current year, the figure is much higher than for English-proficient students. Staff see this as a function of the other characteristics of the students who are LEP, particularly their mobility and level of poverty.

The Chapter 1 Program

The district uses in-class aides for direct assistance to eligible Chapter 1 students, with resource teachers supporting the aides. Chapter 1 instruction is seen as fully supplemental to the content of the curriculum. Most Chapter 1 students receive services in their regular classroom. In some schools with computer labs, students can also be pulled out for lab sessions. The great majority of the Chapter 1 budget is spent on instructional assistants who are assigned to classroom teachers. These teachers may be in regular or bilingual replacement classrooms.

Within the classroom, the instructional assistants work with students on understanding the content of the instruction. For LEP students, content may include ESL as well as integrated language arts or mathematics. In schools with concentrations of LEP students, most of the instructional assistants are bilingual and all have had training in ESL techniques.

Two of the schools visited were school-wide projects, and one of those was also an "academy" magnet (where students proceed at a more individualized pace through an integrated curriculum). Across the district, 22 of the 37 Chapter 1 schools qualify for the school-wide project option based on the percentage of students in poverty as measured by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch.

Programs for LEP Students

Schools with high concentrations of LEP students provide transitional bilingual programs with an objective of placing students in English-only classrooms as quickly as possible. Where there are insufficient concentrations of LEP students in a language group to implement bilingual replacement programs, or for students on waivers, ESL is used and each child has an individual learning plan.

Availability of appropriate staff is a problem, as the LEP population is growing relatively faster than enrollment as a whole. Despite recruiting nationally, the district is reporting increasing shortages of bilingual certified staff.

The district sees primary language instruction and ESL as approaches not programs. Most notably reflecting this perspective, the classroom teachers serve as the ESL teachers. Because there are so many LEP students in the district, ESL is taught in bilingual classes and it is taught in both regular English and sheltered English; ESL is part of the standard program.

The district has two new Title VII projects, one focusing on dropout prevention in a middle school and the other using sheltered English in selected elementary schools. The state's gifted and talented program also provides funding for a special project for gifted LEP students.

The district has had formal policies supporting bilingual education for LEP students since at least 1981. The intensity of that support has varied over the past decade, depending on superintendents, funding, and other factors. At the current time, district-level personnel appear highly supportive, but some school-level staff were actively hostile to primary language instruction, preferring immersion and structured English over bilingual education or even ESL. Most school staff interviewed, however, felt that bilingual education and ESL had an appropriate role. The emphasis in the district was for rapid transition to English; even those supporting bilingual education saw it as a tool for achieving full English proficiency with little concern for primary language maintenance.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Although the language of instruction may not be English, LEP students generally receive the same level and content of Chapter 1 support as English-proficient students. The exception comes in the ESL instruction, where Chapter 1 can be used to assist the student in learning oral English. Chapter 1 ESL in this district is not a distinct program, however; it is simply a supplement for the eligible Chapter 1 student who is having trouble in the regular classroom. The purpose, at least over the long run, is to assist the student's mastery of English-language arts, and ESL is seen as one way of accomplishing that goal.

Coordination at the district level between the Chapter 1 and LEP programs is good. The programs are in the same division and weekly meetings involve both program administrators. The programs submit a joint application to the state for funding, and the state includes both programs in its coordinated compliance review process. According to district personnel, coordination appears to have improved in the past year or so. In part, this improvement stems from the U.S. Department of Education's criticism of the previous Chapter 1 selection practices for LEP students, which forced the programs to develop a joint solution to this problem.

At the school level, coordination occurs on a person-to-person level and through the principal's office. In the visited schools, coordination was not a concern. Staff in both programs saw themselves as offering one program with support for individuals with needs.

DISTRICT A3

Introduction

This large urban district is located in one of the nation's fastest growing regions. While there are many areas of wealth in the city, surrounding districts tend to be wealthier on the whole and lack many of the urban problems of this district. The district is under a desegregation plan resulting from suits by Hispanic parents who believed their children were denied access to special programs because of neighborhood segregation patterns. The results of this court order have greatly affected the operation of the district's schools and pupil assignment practices.

The district has 25 K-5 elementary schools, seven 6-8 middle schools, and eight 9-12 high schools. The average daily attendance (ADA) is 28,600. For the K-5 population, the ADA is about 14,400; among elementary schools, the enrollments range from approximately 250 to 750.

The district uses Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) counts to determine Chapter 1 service areas. Across the district, about 13 percent of students qualify for AFDC, with elementary school percentages ranging from 4 percent to 42 percent. About 5,300 elementary students (37 percent) are eligible for free or reduced-price lunches.

Chapter 1 or state compensatory education (SCE) services are offered in grades K-12, but most are concentrated in elementary schools. Seventeen elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school have Chapter 1 programs.

LEP students are found at all grades but are concentrated at the elementary levels. District personnel indicated they are seeing more and more students (primarily Mexicans) at higher grade levels who have no English and little or any schooling.

By one restrictive definition (i.e., those who require primary-language instruction) about 1,250 elementary students, or around 8 percent, have substantial English-language deficiencies. The great majority of these are Spanish speakers (1,111) with others speaking Vietnamese (123), Mandarin (10), or Cambodian (6).

By a less restrictive definition, which includes all formally identified LEP students, the district counted 3,144 students in grades K-5 (22 percent) across more than 25 language groups. By language group, these included Spanish (2,497), Vietnamese (256), Portuguese (115), Mandarin (36), Cantonese (31), with other languages having fewer than 30 students each. In the elementary grades, the greatest number of LEP students are found in kindergarten (678) and the count decreases each year until grade 5 (355).

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA has published several policy statements related to identification of LEP students. With one of the largest numbers and percentages of LEP students in the country and faced with a large number of often very small school districts, the SEA has taken a leading role.

All students are required to have a home language survey on file that is signed by parents. Each student with a language other than English on the home language survey is to be assessed within 30 days of enrollment. The **oral** English proficiency of students whose parents report any language but English on the home language survey is to be assessed with a state-designated instrument. State approved tests for speaking and comprehension include: BINL (K-12); BSM I/II (K-12); IPT I/II (K-12); LAS I/II, forms A and B and the short form (K-12); Pre-LAS (ages 4-6); and QSE (K-6). An English **reading and writing** skills assessment is to be conducted for students in grades 3 and above who are rated as LEP on their oral skills alone. It is up to districts to establish a process for assessing reading and writing skills.

Students in grades K-2 are considered to be English proficient if scoring fluent on oral assessment unless they score below district-established standards on optional (at these grades) reading or writing assessments. For grades 3-12, students are considered to be English proficient if they are rated as fluent on oral assessment and they score above the district's reading and writing standards.

The state issued an official program advisory in 1988 regarding selection of LEP students for Chapter 1. The program advisory restates Federal law that assessment for Chapter 1 must be based on academic performance, not English-language deficiencies. The SEA

recommends native language testing, examination of academic history, observation, and other informal assessment methods. In addition, the SEA points out that Chapter 1 can supplement the ESL or other language services the student is already receiving if the student is not making progress.

The SEA uses a consolidated compliance review in which several specially funded programs are monitored together, including Chapter 1, SCE, and state programs for LEP students. For Chapter 1 and SCE, monitors address the following relevant points:

- Each participant's needs have been consistently identified annually and assessed with objective educational criteria established by the district.
- Documentation for public school participants is on file at each site.
- Chapter 1 funds are used to provide supplemental educational services to LEP and/or handicapped students when they meet the criteria for Chapter 1 participation.

For state programs for LEP students, the monitors determine whether the district has properly identified, assessed, and reported all students who have a primary language other than English and are LEP. They also review whether there are adequate basic and supplemental resources to provide each LEP student with bilingual learning opportunities in an appropriate program to sustain academic achievement and that the provision of these services is not contingent upon receipt of State or Federal categorical aid funds.

Coordination between the SEA offices administering programs for LEP students and Chapter 1 appears to be limited; for the most part, the Chapter 1 office has left questions about services to LEP students up to the bilingual office. While noting the issues, the Chapter 1 office believes they are essentially local compliance concerns and they can deal with outstanding problems during monitoring visits rather than having to specify details in advance.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. All new students in the district report to a central enrollment center for assessment and assignment to schools. As part of the assessment, the dominant language of the student is determined. All students are to have the results of a home language survey on file. If the home language survey indicates any language

other than English as dominant, then students are to be administered the LAS to classify them as either non-English proficient (NEP), limited-English proficient (LEP), or fully English proficient. In addition, the enrollment center assesses the student's appropriate skill/grade level through tests, including the MAT and a variety of foreign language tests, and an inventory of previous schooling. As part of the court ordered desegregation plan, the enrollment center also assigns students to schools based on race/ethnicity, available space, and residence.

For reclassification from limited to fully English proficient, students must: (1) receive a teacher evaluation on the student oral language observation matrix with ratings of four or five; (2) score four or five on the LAS; (3) produce a writing sample comparable in performance to English speakers; (4) score in the 36th percentile or higher on the CTBS reading, math, and language arts tests (for students between 32nd and 35th percentile, student appraisal teams can override scores); and (5) the student's parents must approve the reclassification.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. In general, students in eligible schools who score below the 46th percentile on the CTBS can be served in Chapter 1. The CTBS is administered only in the spring; eligibility for students arriving at other times can be determined through WRAT, MAT, or the Nelson reading test.

LEP students who have been in an English reading program since the previous November are treated as fully English proficient; they take the CTBS and, if scoring at or below the 45th percentile, qualify for Chapter 1. Spanish-speaking LEP students who are in a bilingual program are tested on the SABE or La Prueba in the spring, with the same percentile cutoff (i.e., 45) used to determine Chapter 1 eligibility.

Non-Spanish speaking LEP students who have not been in an English reading program since the previous November are given a locally developed achievement test in their native language. The district developed this test specifically to meet their understanding of Chapter 1 requirements for selecting students for whom a standardized test does not exist. The test contains brief sections on math facts and sentence reading. Eligibility for Chapter 1 is determined based on the number of items answered correctly. The test was designed to be easily translated so it could be used with students in any language; standard versions are currently

available in Vietnamese, Portuguese, and a few other languages. The test is administered by primary-language speakers.

Although this test was used in the visited schools, its value was questioned by many of the respondents for one or more of the following reasons:

1. It was too short to assess a student's skills adequately.
2. It was too narrowly focused; that is, it did not cover all the same constructs or even the most important ones that the national tests did.
3. It was not well matched to the curriculum.
4. The translations were far too literal--for example, a single-syllable English word might emerge correctly as a three-syllable Vietnamese word, which changes the difficulty level of the test simply on the basis of language.
5. The skills measured were of the "basic" variety, even though the Chapter 1 program was trying to focus more on higher order thinking skills.
6. It was not clear how the cutoff scores were established and whether those cutoffs are equivalent to the 45th percentile on the CTBS.

The nationally standardized tests were also questioned by some school personnel. The main question raised about the CTBS was the extent to which it matched the district's curriculum at specific grade levels. In fact, the test scores by grade do support an argument that the fourth grade reading test is poorly matched to the curriculum, since each year fourth graders as a group score much lower than students in other grades. School personnel also questioned whether the other tests used, particularly the WRAT, SABE, and La Prueba, were comparable to the CTBS. Teacher judgment is not involved in determining Chapter 1 eligibility for LEP students, but a few school-level respondents suggested that teacher judgment might produce a substantially different set of eligible students.

To assign Chapter 1-eligible students to specific services, the overall level of each student's need is assessed based on achievement tests, age/grade discrepancies, grades, and teacher judgment. Since school personnel in all but one of the visited schools indicated that all eligible students are served in Chapter 1, actual rankings of students by need were not given much attention for Chapter 1 placement. The one visited school in which not all eligible students were served had a waiting list of about 45 students for a Chapter 1 program serving over 400 students.

These students were on a waiting list regardless of their level of needs; being on the list only meant that they had been enrolled after the Chapter 1 slots were filled.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 or SCE services are offered in grades K-12, but most are concentrated in elementary schools. Seventeen of 25 elementary schools, 2 of 7 middle schools, and 1 of 8 high schools have Chapter 1 programs. Of the 14,400 elementary students, 4,266 qualify for Chapter 1 (or SCE). At the elementary level, the number of students served differs by grade, from a high of 846 students in first grade to a low of 577 students in fourth grade.

At the elementary school level, most schools offer reading, language arts (oral expression and writing), and math. The district is trying to move away from using the pull-out model, but pull-outs to computer labs are still the most common approach used in math. For reading, a combination of resource room pull-outs, in-class instructional assistants, and "push-in" models, with the resource teacher effectively teaming with the classroom teacher, are used. The district's preference is push-in, but large numbers of instructional assistants are already employed, so pull-outs and in-class aides are still used.

In addition, a few of the schools offer extended-day or extended-year programs which provide enrichment activities. Chapter 1 offers "early bird" before-school sessions for elementary school students at some schools, and several elementary schools offer Chapter 1 extended-year programs in the summer.

Specific Chapter 1 services are determined for each child at the school level. Assignment of students to specific services is a matter of student needs, the programs offered at a specific school, and the number of other students who have needs for Chapter 1. For example, one school reported students with the most needs could actually get three "doses" of Chapter 1 each day: (1) before-school, (2) pull-out computer lab, and (3) push-in services.

In the schools visited, services are based on skills rather than subjects. In two schools with lab-type pull-out programs, classroom teachers provided written lists of specific skills for each child to work on. For push-ins, teachers and Chapter 1 resource personnel reported meeting

weekly or more frequently to discuss needs of individual students and to coordinate their approaches. The Chapter 1 before-school programs in two of the visited schools were geared toward enrichment activities rather than focusing on specific skills; attendance, while encouraged for some students, was voluntary for all.

Many of the Chapter 1 staff are bilingual, and Chapter 1 services may be provided in the students' primary languages or in structured English as required.

Programs for LEP Students

The district uses a combination of transitional bilingual education, structured English, and ESL to serve LEP students. Some LEP children receive all their subjects in their primary language, but more receive primary language instruction in basic skills while receiving sheltered English (or even immersion) in one or more other subjects.

The district has four Title VII grants in various stages, but of more importance is the existence of a desegregation plan designed to reduce imbalances due to language and ethnicity. As part of this plan, many elementary schools are designated as a language-specific bilingual center for Spanish (15 schools), Vietnamese (2 schools), or Portuguese (1 school). In addition, many schools also are designated as magnets with special programs to attract other students.

The district uses two basic approaches for organizing the instruction of its LEP students. Bilingual centers in 16 of the elementary schools (2 schools have more than 1 bilingual center) are designed as replacement programs in Spanish, Vietnamese, or Portuguese. They are geared primarily to students in the early elementary grades but are available to students in all grades. The primary method is transitional bilingual education. Students are transported from their own attendance areas to the bilingual centers.

The second approach is the individual learning plan (ILP). ILPs are used for students who speak a primary language other than English and who either are not in a bilingual center school or have parents who do not want them in a bilingual classroom.

Students on ILPs are generally placed in English-only classrooms in their neighborhood school (or the school assigned by the enrollment center). Depending on the students' individual learning plans and the resources at their schools, they may receive ESL or structured English. In a few cases, no language support is provided.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

No differences in Chapter 1 services were noted for English-proficient and LEP students. Although Chapter 1 provides resource teachers and instructional assistants who may teach in a student's primary language or in structured English, they are not seen as providing language services; rather, they are addressing the academic skills of Chapter 1-eligible students.

DISTRICT B1

Introduction

This large county school district serves over 70,000 students in the elementary schools. In the district, 3,732 of the elementary school students (about 5 percent) are formally identified as LEP. LEP students are predominantly Hispanic, with a very small representation of other European and Asian languages. In addition, almost 47 percent of the students in the district qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. The percentage of students from low-income families in schools ranged from 5 percent to 100 percent, with 10 schools having over 75 percent of their students from low-income families.

Of the 97 elementary schools in the district, 74 have Chapter 1 programs and all 97 have services for LEP students.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. At the time of this study, the SEA had no policies on how LEP students should be identified or served in the Chapter 1 program. Since then, as part of a consent agreement, the SEA and representatives for parents of LEP students have negotiated the development of policies on the identification of LEP students, access to categorical programs, and the provision of ESL services. Under the new policies, Chapter 1 district plans must provide equal access for eligible LEP students and must incorporate programming and services for these students. Regulations for implementing these policies are currently being developed.

The SEA provides funding for language services for LEP students. The funding is part of a weighted formula, with LEP students generating additional funds in the State block grant.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. Upon registration, if parents report a language other than English spoken in the home, as the child's first language, or as the language used in social settings, the student's language proficiency is assessed using a test

developed by a neighboring district. The test is administered by a bilingual aide. The classroom teacher and the aide then discuss the student's English-language skills, look at the results of the test, and determine the student's LEP category:

A no English-language skills,

B predominant speaker of language other than English,

C bilingual speaker of English and another language,

D predominant speaker of English but with facility in another language, and

E monolingual speaker of English with a foreign language background.

Those in categories D and E are considered English proficient.

Several of the bilingual aides mentioned that they do not believe the locally developed test is a valuable assessment tool. There is only one version of the test and it does not vary by grade level. Students who are being retested may take the same test several times, which was seen as jeopardizing the validity of the test score.

The LAMS test gives more specific information about the skills/needs of a LEP student. This test is also administered by the bilingual aide. The LAMS is used to assess skills in reading, writing, and oral comprehension. A map of results is completed for each LEP student, and teachers address skill areas based on the test results.

Local Policies and Procedures on Chapter 1 Student Selection. Students must be enrolled in a district school for 40 school days before consideration for Chapter 1 selection. Students are selected for Chapter 1 based on scores from the CTBS achievement test. Beginning next year, the Stanford will be used instead of the CTBS. After the test results are in, the district determines a cutoff for Chapter 1 eligibility. This year's cutoff was the 30th percentile for reading and the 35th percentile for math. All students in grades 2 or above who score below the cutoff are served in the program unless they are exempted or their parents refuse the service. To be eligible for Chapter 1 reading services in grade 1, a student also must be a first grade repeater.

LEP students who are in category C take the CTBS and are selected for Chapter 1 in the same way as English-proficient students.

LEP students in categories A or B are selected for Chapter 1 reading through an alternative process. LEP students are given a LAMS test of language proficiency. This test provides information about a student's specific language skills and needs. If a student is in levels one, two, or three on the LAMS and the teacher recommends Chapter 1 services, a referral form is completed. The teacher must document the poor academic performance of the student, fill in the test data from the LAMS, and meet with the Chapter 1 teacher, administrators, and bilingual aides to discuss the appropriateness of Chapter 1 services for the student. If the committee agrees that the student could benefit from Chapter 1, he or she is entered into the program. If a LEP student is in Category A or B, but scores level four on the LAMS, he or she must take the CTBS to qualify for Chapter 1.

For a sixth-grade LEP student to receive Chapter 1 math (the only grade level to receive math remediation) teachers assess the student's math skills on a district-developed criteria checklist. If the student has mastered less than 80 percent of the skills on the list, the teacher can request that the student be tested on the computational subtest of the Stanford. If the score is below the 35th percentile, the student is eligible for Chapter 1 math.

First grade Category A or B LEP students may be served in Chapter 1 if they were retained and their basal placement in the MacMillan reading series is at or below: level four in the first nine weeks of school, level six in the second nine weeks, level seven in the third nine weeks, and level nine in the fourth nine weeks. If these criteria are met, in addition to the grade retention and percentile requirements described above, the grade 1 LEP referral form is completed and the committee of teachers and administrators meets to discuss the placement.

While in theory the process designed to select LEP students for Chapter 1 may appear to be an effective means of distinguishing between educational deprivation and language deficiency, in practice, almost all category A and B LEP students are receiving Chapter 1 services.

LEP students in categories A and B may remain in Chapter 1 for no more than two years before taking the CTBS. At that point, they must qualify for Chapter 1 by scoring below the percentile cutoff.

Teachers and administrators felt the burden of assessing the compensatory education needs of LEP students in categories A and B was quite small. Because all LEP students are given the locally developed test and the LAMS test, the only additional time required for Chapter 1 assessment was the meeting with teachers and administrators. Typically, they would meet for two to three hours to discuss all of the LEP students referred to Chapter 1.

The Chapter 1 Program

Over 11,000 students in grades 1-6 were served in Chapter 1 in 1988-89. The Chapter 1 reading program operates as a pull-out for grades 2-5 and in-class for grade 1. Students in the reading pull-out, on average, receive 45 minutes of instruction per day in groups of approximately 5 students.

There are 12 grade-6 centers (schools that house only grade-6 students), with a Chapter 1 reading/language arts replacement program and a math replacement program. Students in the replacement program receive 2 hours of instruction per day in reading/language arts and 1 hour per day in math, in ratios of 16 students per adult.

There is also a Chapter 1 math pull-out available for grade-6 students attending K-6 schools.

Many of the Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers speak Spanish. Moreover, Chapter 1 teachers who do not speak Spanish typically have a Spanish-speaking aide who will assist by translating for LEP students.

There is also a State compensatory education program in the district called LIFT. It typically serves students who score between the 30th and 45th percentile on the CTBS. It is a replacement program serving 18 students in grades 4 and 5. The classroom teacher also has a full-time instructional aide. Although there is an effort to make the LIFT program and the Chapter 1 program serve different students, there is some overlap in students served.

Programs for LEP Students

Bilingual aides provide in-class assistance for all LEP students in the district. These aides typically work with three to five classes, spending a portion of every day in each class. For LEP students who speak languages other than Spanish, the district attempts to hire part-time paraprofessionals who speak the student's primary language. The district employs approximately 170 full-time instructional aides to serve LEP students. Of those, one is Korean, five to six are Vietnamese, and the remainder are Spanish speaking.

Some regular classroom teachers in grades 1-3 have been trained in providing intensive English instruction. This instructional approach includes the use of revised reading materials to target the needs of LEP students through a whole-language method.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

The use of in-class aides for addressing the language needs of LEP students reduces the number of pull-outs for any given child and makes coordination between the regular classroom teacher and the bilingual aide quite easy.

The Chapter 1 teachers claim they have not altered their instructional methods to serve LEP students; however, there is typically a Spanish-speaking teacher or aide in each Chapter 1 class to translate for the monolingual LEP students. Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers indicated that they discuss student needs fairly often and claim that coordination is not a problem.

While no policy in the district restricts the number of categorical programs a student may receive, a procedure has been developed to address concerns about multiple pull-outs. If a parent or teacher feels a student is being pulled out too frequently (this happens typically for speech impaired or other mildly handicapped students), a student service team composed of all of the student's teachers as well as a school administrator meet to discuss the student's needs. At that point, the student may be exempted from Chapter 1 while continuing to receive special education and/or LEP services.

DISTRICT B2

Introduction

The population of this county is increasing rapidly due to the popularity of the region and concomitant new development. A parallel increase in the county's student population, and specifically the LEP student population, has created problems for the county school system because the growth is occurring faster than the expansion of funds, facilities, and staff.

The socioeconomic status of the county's population is generally low. Based on eligibility for free and reduced-price lunch, approximately 30 percent of the students come from low-income families. District staff also reported, however, that only 15 percent of the remaining 70 percent of the population is above average means. In fact, most jobs in the county are blue-collar; teachers comprise the largest professional population.

The district has approximately 16,500 students. The count of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches is 5,023; the figure for the elementary school students is approximately 2,800.

The primary non-English language group in the county is Spanish, although other languages are represented, such as French, Haitian and Asian languages. Many of the Spanish-speaking families in the area come from Puerto Rico.

The district's students are served in 12 elementary schools (grades K-5), four middle schools (grades 6-8), and three high schools (grades 9-12). Approximately 370 elementary school students are identified as LEP; these students are enrolled in five elementary schools that have programs for LEP students. Nine of the district's 12 elementary schools offer Chapter 1 services. Four elementary schools have both Chapter 1 and LEP services.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. At the time of this study, the SEA had no policies on how LEP students should be identified or served in the Chapter 1 program. Since then, as part of a consent agreement, the SEA and representatives for parents of LEP students have negotiated the development of policies on the identification of LEP students, access to categorical programs, and the provision of ESL services. Under the new policies, Chapter 1 district plans must provide equal access for eligible LEP students and must incorporate programming and services for these students. Regulations for implementing these policies are currently being developed.

The SEA provides funding for language services for LEP students. The funding is part of a weighted formula, with LEP students generating additional funds in the state block grant.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. The identification of LEP students is generally begun at the time of student registration. Registrars (school secretaries) provide a preliminary language survey to families of incoming students who appear less than proficient in English. The survey asks for:

- the first language the child learned to speak;
- the language the child speaks socially;
- the language most frequently spoken at home;
- the primary language of the mother; and
- the primary language of the father.

The registrars have been provided some in-service training by two district-level resource teachers who have primary responsibility both for testing and for program operations of intensive English. The training is intended to help the registrars identify students accurately and deal with their families in a sensitive manner.

One of the resource teachers reviews the preliminary language surveys. The process of LEP student identification and referral into the intensive English program continues with tests that are administered by the resource teachers. At the elementary school level, four tests, the

Shutt Primary Language Indicators Test (SPLIT), the IPT, and the LAB test, levels I (grades K-2) and II (grades 3-6), as well as oral interviews conducted by speakers of the student's native language make up this process. A score of less than 36 percent on the LAB test indicates a need for intensive English services. In addition, entering students whose primary language is Spanish are given the SABE to determine skills in reading and mathematics. The rationale for the use of so many instruments is to de-emphasize the importance of any one test or interview. Cumulatively, the tests result in the classification of students on a scale ranging from L-1 (Spanish-dominant, English-deficient) to L-5 (English-dominant, Spanish deficient). Those students who rank at the L-1 or L-2 level are selected for the intensive English program. Explicit parental consent is necessary for the student to be enrolled in the program, and the parents may withdraw the student at any time.

The criteria used to enroll students in intensive English also determine their eligibility to be exited from the program. A rating of L-3 or better indicates readiness to enter the regular classroom program. This is done gradually through a trial mainstreaming process in which the students' progress is monitored by the classroom teacher, the intensive English teacher, and the district resource teacher to see how the adjustment is proceeding. Only when all parties are satisfied that the student will succeed in the regular classroom is the student formally exited.

The formal exit process requires that a student (after one grading period in the regular classroom) receive at least a stanine of four on the total reading portion of the SAT. If this is not achieved, the conditionally mainstreamed student is returned to the intensive English program.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. The district uses the SAT for Chapter 1 student selection. Students scoring at or below the 25th percentile in total reading and total math are eligible for services and currently all of these students receive services. Those students who rank between the 26th and 49th percentile are also eligible, but are served after the priority group based on level of need. The level of need for students scoring between the 26th and 49th percentiles is based on a multi-criteria teacher checklist. Teachers check off behaviors and skills displayed in the classroom, and the scores are weighted. Higher scores indicate greater need and students are served from the top down as far as funds allow. The checklist was designed by the district to make teacher judgment more objective.

Some LEP students have been selected for Chapter 1 math services based on their math scores on the SABE. LEP students are not assessed for Chapter 1 reading until they attain a score of L-3 on the scale of English-language proficiency, that corresponds with exit from the intensive English program and return to the regular classroom program.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 serves about 700 students in nine elementary schools. Services consist of reading/language arts and math provided in grades 2 through 5. The Chapter 1 program in the district was completely revamped based on disappointing test score results in 1989-90. The previously existing pull-out program was replaced by computer laboratories staffed by paraprofessionals. In the laboratories, Chapter 1 students receive 20 minutes a day of individualized computer instruction in reading and/or mathematics assisted by Chapter 1 aides. The individualized computer programs allow each student to work at his/her own pace (not self-determined, but individually tailored) against his/her own record of progress. (While the software used in these labs is available in Spanish and is used in Spanish for adult learners, only the English version is used for Chapter 1 students).

Ongoing communications between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers and between schools and parents are emphasized. Weekly progress reports and on-request teacher conferences are available to parents, although very few of them reportedly take advantage of the latter option. Chapter 1 aides and classroom teachers confer every two weeks. Before a student is dismissed from the Chapter 1 program, district policy requires that an agreement be signed by the principal and the parents.

Programs for LEP Students

The locally developed program serving LEP students is called Intensive English; it is designed to serve students whose primary home language is other than English and who are limited English proficient. Intensive English is funded by the state's formula reimbursement with additional expenses assumed by the district. It is an ESL, limited pull-out program in language arts

(reading, writing, listening and speaking) designed to provide instruction necessary for the student to remain at grade level during the transition from Spanish (or other language) dominance to English. The LEP students are pulled out of the regular classroom for the same amount of time as the regularly allotted language arts classroom time. Students in kindergarten spend 30 minutes a day in the program; students in grades 1 through 3 may spend up to 2 ½ hours a day; and students in grades 4 and 5 may spend up to 2 hours a day. In addition, the LEP students are generally placed in regular classrooms where the teachers and/or aides are bilingual. The goals of intensive English are:

- To enable non- or limited-English-proficient students to become proficient in English;
- To allow a non- or limited-English-proficient student to remain in the program until such time as he/she is able to function independently at his/her proper grade level; and
- To reduce the language-related drop-out rate in schools.

Underlying these goals is a basic philosophy that "survival English" should be an early goal, and so the primary emphasis is on English for academic survival. The district program also emphasizes consideration of cultural aspects of the LEP population, both in terms of adjustments facing LEP students and contributions they may make to the overall student population. The district considers it important to highlight the positive aspects of having students from other cultures in the schools. And, within the intensive English program, teachers attempt to address not just linguistic but also cultural differences and cultural education.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Programs for LEP and Chapter 1 are under the administration of the Director of Instructional Programs and it is there that coordination occurs. The two Instructional Resource Teachers who handle the testing and conduct day-to-day operations of the LEP program are in the same office, and one of them was formerly a Chapter 1 administrator. Although there are currently no provisions in place to ensure coordination at the state level between Chapter 1 and the program for LEP students, the establishment of such coordination is part of the consent decree which is being worked out in the previously mentioned court case.

District policy requires that enrollment in intensive English take precedence over receiving Chapter 1 services, and that English proficiency be established and evaluated before consideration for Chapter 1 services. While it is possible to serve students in both intensive English and Chapter 1, several circumstances mitigate against this:

- Chapter 1 aides are not bilingual.
- There is no Spanish version of the SAT to identify students - - (although the SABE may be used similarly).
- Both programs are pull-outs and classroom teachers look askance at students spending excessive time out of the regular program.

DISTRICT C1

Introduction

This is a large city school district with a total enrollment of 417,000. The district has approximately 600 schools of which 491 are elementary schools with a variety of grade configurations.

About 43 percent of the students come from low-income families and 86 percent of the students are from minority groups. There is a large and diverse foreign language population among the student body. A large Spanish-speaking population lives in the district and there are also many other language groups represented in the schools. Approximately 40,000 students in grades K-12 are served in programs for LEP students. Primary languages of the students include Arabic, Assyrian, Chinese, Greek, Gujarati, Haitian, Creole, Hindi, Italian, Khymer, Korean, Laotian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, Urdu, and Vietnamese.

The district is currently undergoing major changes due to a state reform act that mandated community control of the schools. Turmoil in the district due to that change has been magnified by a major reorganization of the central office.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The state policy for the identification of LEP students mandates a broad three-step process. First, at the time of school registration, likely LEP students are identified by the school secretary. Next, a home language survey is completed by the parent to determine the student's primary language background. An interview is then conducted to determine the oral English proficiency level of each potential LEP student.

There are two state-wide programs for elementary LEP students, the Transitional Bilingual Education program (TBE) and the Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI). The TBE program is intended for districts with more than 20 students in one language group and requires a certified teacher. If there are less than 20 students in any one language group, either TBE or TPI

services are provided. The TPI does not require a certified teacher. The state provides a per-student reimbursement for services to LEP students and funds a Reading Improvement program with which some schools fund bilingual aides to assist transitional LEP students.

The only state guidelines for the selection of Chapter 1 students is that there must be a cutoff point established by the LEA. Overall, Chapter 1 policies are decentralized, first to the LEA and then to the school.

There is apparently no coordination at the SEA level of services for LEP students and Chapter 1 students, although the offices that oversee the administration of the two programs are housed within the same administrative unit.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. The district follows the framework set out by the SEA for identifying LEP students, beginning with a screening process at student registration. A home language survey is given to parents. If a student is identified as coming from a non-English background, an individual student language assessment is conducted by school-level bilingual staff within 10 days school of enrollment. The assessment includes the Functional Language Assessment (FLA), which measures the student's listening and speaking skills in English, and other measures of the student's reading and writing skills. A student is identified as LEP if he/she scores low to moderate on these assessments. The student's responses are entered into the on-line computer bilingual information system.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Chapter 1 students are identified based on scores from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) which is administered each spring to students in first grade and above. Students are eligible for Chapter 1 if they score at least one year below grade level and are recommended by a teacher and/or principal.

District-level Chapter 1 staff are aware of the regulation that they must serve LEP students on the basis of educational need, not language deficiency. However in general, Chapter 1 services are <u>not</u> available to students enrolled in the full-time bilingual instructional programs. The district Chapter 1 coordinator stated that "students who are eligible for state bilingual services must receive that first, before they can receive Chapter 1." Those students who are mainstreamed from the bilingual instruction into the regular classroom are then eligible for Chapter 1 services as necessary. At the school level, a decision is sometimes made to provide English as a Second

Language (ESL) aides through the Chapter 1 project. Chapter 1 services are provided to mainstreamed LEP students in the same manner as other Chapter 1 students, although teachers claim that identification of students in need of services is sometimes a problem because they do not consider assessment tools adequate or appropriate.

The Chapter 1 Program

Last year, 50,733 elementary school students and 15,600 secondary school students were enrolled in Chapter 1 programs. Chapter 1 is a PK-12 program, and about 318 of the 600 schools participate in Chapter 1. There is also a "smattering" of ESL under Chapter 1. Chapter 1 programs are decentralized, and are planned and implemented at the school level. Across the district, however, reading is the top priority and math is second, although some schools offer a combination of reading and math.

Five elementary schools and one secondary school have Chapter 1 school-wide projects. For the remainder of the schools, self-contained classrooms or pull-out programs are used.

The self-contained classroom approach allows participating pupils in pre-school through grade eight to receive all of their instruction through one of the following models:

- half-day structured learning experiences for pre-K and Kindergarten pupils by a Chapter 1 teacher;
- full-day instruction for 38-50 Kindergarten pupils with a locally funded teacher and a Chapter 1 teacher; or
- one classroom of pupils (grade 1-8) divided between a locally funded teacher and a Chapter 1 teacher, each having one-half the regular class size.

Intensive instruction and varied learning activities are provided in these environments. Approximately 11,000 elementary school Chapter 1 students are served in self-contained classrooms.

Pull-out programs are provided as supplementary services in a variety of curriculum areas. Approximately 35,000 K-8 students are served in pull-out programs. Identified students

receive daily instruction in 30-40 minute periods to supplement and support the regular program of instruction. Service delivery patterns include:

- instruction in a computer lab, offering diagnosis, prescription, and evaluation in a variety of subjects for groups of 9-24 students;
- teacher-directed instruction in various subject areas for groups of 8 to 10 students;
- a basic occupational and skills training program which provides vocational experiences for 20-25 students; and
- a reading recovery program which provides 30 minutes per day of one-on-one tutoring sessions for first-grade pupils.

Supportive services and special programs (Child-Parent Centers, Follow Through, Family Guidance Center, and Parental Involvement and Training) are also provided through the Chapter 1 program.

Programs for LEP Students

Services for LEP students are provided in grades K-12, and there are 1,200 bilingual education teachers in the system to provide these services. The district offers over 300 bilingual education programs to approximately 40,000 LEP students. Language services are divided into three categories (A, B, and C) depending on the degree to which primary language instruction is used.

Students in category A understand little or no English. These students require content area concepts to be developed in the native language while acquiring English language skills through ESL instruction.

Students in category B understand the English used in most familiar and school-related settings. These students need content area concepts to be developed initially in the native language with a gradual transition from the native language to English. ESL instruction is also required.

Students in category C understand most English without difficulty. They only occasionally require that communications be clarified, restated, or rewritten. These students can benefit from academic instruction in English but may require native-language support in a few subjects. ESL instruction is also required for these students.

The bilingual programs in the district are divided into two groups, Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) and Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI). As mandated by the State, TBE is intended for groups of 20 or more students with the same primary language. They are taught all subjects in self-contained classrooms using primary language instruction (Level A), and when they gain some proficiency (Level B) they receive one-half of their instruction in English and the other half in their primary language. Students who meet the criteria for Level C are in part-time TBE programs and receive ESL and support services.

When there are fewer than 20 students with the same language background in a school, students take part in a TPI. Students receive instruction in science, math, and social studies in a pull-out setting from bilingual staff who attempt to use simplified English in instructing students but may use native language instruction when needed. ESL instruction is also provided. Parents have the option of transferring a student to a school where TBE is offered.

Students are expected to participate in either TBE or TPI for three years, but may stay longer if exit criteria are not met. At the end of each school year, student performance is assessed by the bilingual staff, and subsequent placement (in category A, B, C) is based on the exit criteria that have been set for each instructional category. When a student has met the exit criteria on the ITBS and other measures, he/she is assigned to instructional category GP (General Program) and placed into the mainstream classroom. GP students are monitored to assure that they are performing adequately in the classroom. If not, assistance is provided, or they may reenter a bilingual program.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Chapter 1 and programs for LEP students are in two separate, uncoordinated departments. As part of the recent cutbacks in staff, the liaison position between Chapter 1 and programs for LEP students was eliminated.

Chapter 1 services are designed, to a large degree, at the school level. Each school submits its own Chapter 1 application which is reviewed by the central office. Therefore, practices regarding Chapter 1 services to LEP students varied across the visited schools.

One school used its Chapter 1 funds for augmented staffing in grades 4, 5, and 6 (i.e., the classes were split into two groups each with a separate teacher, and was called the ESEA class). Category C LEP students were placed in the class. But the school-level bilingual coordinator viewed Chapter 1 as a stigma and expressed some resistance to having the children move into the Chapter 1 class. The principal, on the other hand, felt she would like to serve LEP students in Chapter 1 sooner, but student selection was viewed as a problem because no appropriate tests were used in that school for assessing the Chapter 1 needs of LEP students.

At a second school, bilingual Chapter 1 aides provided services to TBE students in a pull-out setting. Students were identified through teacher tests and teacher recommendations.

At a third school, one in which the language services were primarily ESL pull-outs, staff expressed great concern about the difficulty of identifying LEP students for Chapter 1 due to inappropriate assessment tools. Some LEP students received Chapter 1 services based on teacher recommendations, but those classes were not available at every grade level. Further, the Chapter 1 teacher could only handle a limited number of LEP students in the class and still provide adequate service to them and the others. The central problem was expressed by several respondents, "Kids may be delayed access to services for a long time because of the time it takes for assessment, and to really understand whether the child has a language deficiency or an educational deficiency." "No two people seem to agree on where we stand and what we should be doing." "Some [LEP students] act out in regular class, can't cope, need more support."

In general, if LEP students are in a full bilingual program, they are not likely to receive Chapter 1 services. For those who are mainstreamed, they are just as likely to receive Chapter 1 services as English proficient students. However, if a student cannot take the ITBS, it may take the teacher as long as two years to determine that the deficiency is in reading and not only in language. Further both Chapter 1 and the program for LEP students are typically self-contained. At least for Spanish-speaking LEP students, this makes it harder to provide both

services to a single student; as a result, non-Spanish speaking LEP students are more likely to receive Chapter 1 services because they are in mainstreamed classrooms.

There is little coordination between Chapter 1 and the programs for LEP students at the state, district or school levels. Whatever previous coordination existed at the district level has been reduced by recent cutbacks. Coordination is also minimal at the school level but may vary from school to school.

DISTRICT C2

Introduction

This is a small city school district with six elementary schools. The total enrollment (K-12) is 5,090 and 1,566 (31 percent) of these receive free or reduced-price lunches. At the elementary level, the percentage of students on free or reduced-price lunch totals 26.5 percent. There are 460 students eligible for Chapter 1 services in the district and all are being served.

The presence of a major university in the district contributes to a wide range of foreign languages in the schools. Korean is currently the predominant language of university-associated elementary school LEP students. There is also a refugee population in the district which includes speakers of Cambodian, Lao, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Spanish. Most language services for LEP students are funded by a Federal Title VII grant that was due to run out after the school year covered by this study. It was not clear what services the district would offer when that occurred.

All elementary grade level services to LEP students in the district are centralized at one school. An estimated 75 percent of the LEP students in the district reside in the attendance area served by that school and others are bused there for these services. At the time of court-ordered desegregation, the district began busing the children of university students to the primarily black elementary school. As a result, the black population of the elementary school was joined by a population of non-English speakers and the school became a natural "magnet" for LEP services.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The state policy for identifying LEP students mandates a broad three-step process. First, at the time of school registration, likely LEP students are identified by the school secretary. Second, a home language survey is completed by the parent to determine the primary language background. Third, an interview is conducted to determine the oral English proficiency level of each potentially LEP student and the interviewer determines the student's level of English proficiency.

There are two state-wide programs for elementary LEP students, the Transitional Bilingual Education program (TBE) and the Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI). The TBE program is intended for districts with more than 20 students in one language group and requires a certified teacher. If there are less than 20 students in any one language group, either TBE or TPI services may be provided. The TPI does not require a certified teacher. The state provides a per-student reimbursement for services to LEP students and funds a Reading Improvement program that some schools use to fund bilingual aides to assist transitional LEP students.

There is apparently no coordination at the state level of services for LEP students and Chapter 1 students, although the offices that oversee the administration of the two programs are housed within the same administrative unit.

The only state guidelines for the selection of Chapter 1 students are that there must be a cutoff point established by the district. Overall, Chapter 1 selection is decentralized, first to the district and then to the school.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. In the district, the identification of LEP students begins in the fall when students who seem to have a problem with English are identified at school registration and their families are given a home language survey. The registration forms for these students are set aside for review by the LEP program coordinator. Following review of the forms, the LEP program coordinator sends each school a list of any students who should be tested for English language proficiency.

LEP students are assessed at the end of each semester using a variety of tests. For first graders, the PPVT is used to test English comprehension. Students in grades two through six take district-made reading and writing tests. The FLA is used to test vocabulary and structure.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Students are selected for Chapter 1 through teacher judgement, standardized tests, and reading achievement level. At the first grade, because there are no standardized test data, teacher judgement may be the sole criterion. All of the elementary schools, except the school housing the LEP program, use the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). The LEP program school, because of its Title VII grant, uses the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), which was previously used district-wide. Teacher

assessment of reading achievement determines whether a student is reading at or below "anticipated achievement." Performance at a level one or more years below "anticipated achievement" indicates a need for Chapter 1 services.

This selection process may also involve the Building Screening Committee (BSC), one in each school, that consists of administrators, teachers, specialists, a psychologist, and a social worker. If language is a factor, the bilingual director is also involved. Students are referred to the BSC by teachers based on their judgement of the student's performance and teachers may request that additional people be added to the BSC for any specific student or situation. The BSC is multi-functional; its decisions may include referrals to Chapter 1, language programs, or psychological or physical testing, or suggestions of new strategies to be used in the classroom. Once students are in Chapter 1, Chapter 1 teachers use a combination of their own judgment, district-made tests, and the Stanford Achievement Tests to monitor progress.

LEP students who choose not to attend the elementary school that houses the special language program are assessed and selected for Chapter 1 in the same way as English-proficient students.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 services are provided in three of the six elementary schools in the district, and there is also a Chapter 1 high school math program. In the elementary schools, grades 1 through 3 are served by Chapter 1 in reading and math. The program uses pull-outs. At the elementary level, pull-out services are five times per week, 30 minutes per day and typically are provided to groups of six students or less. Instruction is provided by certified teachers and usually includes reinforcement of skills introduced in the regular classroom.

Programs for LEP Students

LEP students frequently spend a week or so in the home school before a final judgment is made to transfer them to the elementary school with a LEP program. Teacher judgment is an integral component in this final decision as is classroom performance. In practice,

any student who is not fluent in English and who is reading below grade level is generally identified as LEP and transferred. Principals think that this is a better option than retaining the child and placing him/her in Chapter 1 -- the local perspective is that the language difficulty may be deflating test scores, the program for LEP students provides an excellent educational opportunity, and that LEP students can "always get Chapter 1 later."

In the LEP program, there are four state-funded teachers who provide services in language arts, science, art, literature, and reading. These teachers assist students with learning the vocabulary and content of instruction by using simplified English and primary-language support when needed.

Under the Title VII grant, students receive at least one half-hour of a pull-out bilingual maintenance program in their native language and culture. This part of the program includes reading, writing, social studies, and math in 13 different languages. The rational for the mixture of simplified English and maintenance bilingual services is that many of these students, while they need English to function in school, will be returning to their own countries when their parents finish graduate school and should not lose touch with their native languages and cultures.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

At the LEP program school, only three LEP students have been served by Chapter 1 in the last four years. There are two reasons so few are served: first, it is general district policy to serve a student's language needs before considering academic skills remediation; second, many LEP students, particularly those whose parents are graduate students, do not need remediation.

Coordination of the two programs at the district level is quite poor. The Chapter 1 director reports directly to the Superintendent of Schools and the Bilingual Director reports to the Director of Instruction. The bilingual program seems to operate quite independently from the district, perhaps because it is federally funded. There is, in fact, outspoken hostility for the Chapter 1 program by the LEP program director and determination on her part not to deal with Chapter 1 unless absolutely necessary.

DISTRICT C3

Introduction

This district is in a far-flung suburb 35 miles from the city center, with a population of approximately 12,550. This is an elementary-only district; older students are bused to a consolidated high school. The school district serves 2,806 elementary school-aged students in five K-6 elementary schools, and one junior high school.

Approximately 25 percent (688) of the student population comes from homes in which a language other than English is spoken. Spanish is the primary language for 604 of the LEP students and the district has approximately 24 other languages represented among the 84 remaining LEP students.

Four factors appear to explain the broad range of language backgrounds in the district. First, an international center for science is located within the district's catchment area and employs personnel from around the world. A second factor in the composition of the LEP population is the availability of industrial and agricultural employment. A new influx of rural Mexican laborers is now moving into the area. The new immigrants are less educated and less wealthy than previous Mexican immigrants who settled in the area a generation ago and has since acquired English and American culture.

Third, in addition to these employment considerations, local churches and social agencies have initiated an assistance program for locating and housing non-English speaking families in the area. An unexpected result has been the formation of an informal network which continues to attract families to the area, particularly from rural Mexico.

The fourth factor drawing recent immigrants to the area is the large number of apartments in the district. Surrounding suburbs are zoned for single-family houses. The apartments attract a low-income population.

As a result of these economic and social factors, many of the non-Spanish speaking LEP families are affluent. In addition, there are two distinct Hispanic populations -- one English

speaking and acculturated, the other Spanish speaking and largely unschooled. Many of the economically poorest families in the district are English-speaking and white.

Based on free and reduced-price lunch figures, low-income enrollment in the district is 16 percent. Among the LEP students, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch is 44 percent.

Currently, 121 students are enrolled in compensatory education programs. Three of the six schools in the district receive Chapter 1 funding, and the district funds a local compensatory education program in two additional schools. The Chapter 1 and local compensatory education programs are identical except for the funding sources.

Services for LEP students are provided in grades one through six at grade-specific bilingual centers; one elementary school serves as the center for bilingual education for a particular grade, serving students from two or more other school areas. Participating students are bused to the bilingual center for a half-day program. At the junior high school level, a transitional bilingual education program is provided for LEP students.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The state policy for identifying LEP students mandates a broad three-step process. First, at the time of school registration, likely LEP students are identified by the school secretary. Second, a home-language survey is completed by the parent to determine the primary-language background. Third, an interview is conducted to determine the oral English-proficiency level of each potentially LEP student.

There are two state-wide programs for elementary LEP students, the Transitional Bilingual Education program (TBE) and the Transitional Program of Instruction (TPI). The TBE program is intended for districts with more than 20 students in one language group and requires a certified teacher. If there are less than 20 students in any one language group, either TBE or TPI services are provided. The TPI does not require a certified teacher. The state provides a per-student reimbursement for services to LEP students and also funds a Reading Improvement program which some schools use to fund bilingual aides to assist transitional LEP students.

The only state guidelines for the selection of Chapter 1 students is that there must be a cutoff point established by the district. Overall, Chapter 1 selection is decentralized, first to the district and then to the school.

There is apparently no coordination at the SEA level of services for LEP students and Chapter 1 students, although the offices that oversee the administration of the two programs are housed under the same administrative unit.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. LEP students are formally identified based on the Language Assessment Survey (LAS). This test is administered by bilingual education teachers in kindergarten, or at the time of enrollment, following the home-language survey. Students who score four or below on the LAS scale are automatically considered LEP and are enrolled in a TBE or TPI program.

LEP students are retested annually and are exited from the program when they score a four or five on the LAS scale. The recommendations of classroom and bilingual teachers are also an important consideration in the exit process.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Students are selected for Chapter 1 services based on classroom performance; achievement on criterion-referenced tests; scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS); and, on request by a classroom teacher, decisions by an administrative team. Criterion-referenced tests are administered to students in first grade or at the time of enrollment. The ITBS is first administered in the spring of second grade and annually thereafter. English-speaking students who score a year below grade level on the ITBS are referred for Chapter 1 services and are served on a worst-first basis as determined by the test score. Teacher judgment is used to select first graders for Chapter 1 and may also be used to refer a student for Chapter 1 when the teacher feels the test score does not accurately reflect student achievement.

LEP students are eligible for Chapter 1 only if they score four or five on the LAS scale. At that point, they take the ITBS with the other students and their scores are ranked along with their English proficient peers. LEP students who score below four on the LAS scale generally participate only in the bilingual program.

Achievement levels of Spanish-speaking LEP students in reading, math, science, and social studies is assessed in Spanish using the La Prueba. However, these data are not typically used in Chapter 1 selection. No primary-language tests are used for LEP students who speak other languages.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 instructional services are provided in a pull-out setting and offer reading and language arts instruction. The program serves students in grades 1 through 5. Pull-out sessions typically last about 30 minutes and are provided in groups of six students or less. All instruction is provided by certified teachers. Chapter 1 serves about 60 students, or just 2 percent of the enrollment.

Most of the teachers who work in Chapter 1 are also special education teachers; they teach Chapter 1 in the morning and provide special education services in the afternoon. None of the district's Chapter 1 teachers is bilingual.

Programs for LEP Students

TBE is a replacement program consisting of instruction by bilingual teachers. The program consumes half a day but part of that time is devoted to busing some students back and forth from the bilingual centers. Students in grades 1 through 6 receive instruction in Spanish in reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and also receive ESL instruction. Bilingual teachers are responsible for grading LEP students in these subjects.

The 84 LEP students who speak languages other than Spanish are placed, along with Spanish-speaking students, in the TBE classes.

A new Title VII grant beginning in 1990-91 allows for change and expansion of the programs for LEP students. The district will adopt a full-day bilingual education program for Spanish-speaking students and will provide ESL services for speakers of other languages. The Title VII grant will allow each school to have one bilingual first grade class (out of three total) and

one bilingual second grade class (out of two total). Students in third grade and above will be served in ESL programs through the use of classroom aides.

Philosophically, the district is committed to a bilingual rather than an ESL approach to educating its LEP students, an approach which is being modified only slightly with the new Title VII grant. Some of the classroom teachers were not pleased with the old program: first, because it takes students out of the classroom for all of their core subjects; second, because it does not have sufficient emphasis on learning English and transitioning to the mainstream; and third, because it favors Spanish-speaking students over those who speak other languages. One teacher gave an example of a third grader who came into the school speaking only German. After 2 months in the bilingual program, he was looking at flash cards and saying "libro," "casa," etc.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Local policy regarding the eligibility of LEP students for Chapter 1 services has recently been revised. In the past, it was explicitly stated that no students could be enrolled in both the Chapter 1 program and programs for LEP students. The new policy states that students who are receiving bilingual instruction and are also eligible for Chapter 1 may receive Chapter 1 if they have a ranking of four or five on the LAS or pre-LAS scale. Under this new policy, three students in the district are receiving both bilingual and Chapter 1 services.

Philosophically, the district is strongly committed to a sequential approach in providing language services prior to remedial services. Several conditions must be met for LEP students to receive Chapter 1 services: they must score at least a four on the LAS; appropriate Chapter 1 services must be available during the half-day the student is in the home school; and the classroom and Chapter 1 teachers must agree that Chapter 1 services are more important than the stability of an uninterrupted half-day in the regular classroom. Further, since LEP students may be exited from language services once they reach level 4 on the LAS, i.e., the students are technically no longer limited English proficient, it does not appear that any LEP students receive Chapter 1 services in this district.

Coordination between the regular classroom and the bilingual curriculum has been improved by the adoption of the Scott Foresman reading series; it is available in Spanish and

English. Using this series in both programs guarantees that students in the bilingual program will be reading the same thing as their English-speaking peers. The Foresman reading books make the transition for LEP students (at least Spanish-speaking ones) from the bilingual program to the regular program easier.

DISTRICT D1

Introduction

This is a suburban school district adjacent to a large metropolitan area. While very close to an urban center, this town appears quite rural; over time, the city has grown out to meet this small town which was once quite distinct from its urban neighbor. A large university is in the district's catchment area.

The LEP population of the district is composed of the children of university students and professors, and a small Hmong population. During 1989-90, 88 of the 3,700 students enrolled in grades K-6 were identified as LEP. About 580 (or 16 percent) of the district's elementary school students receive free- or reduced-price lunch.

There are seven elementary schools in the district. Four of these schools offer Chapter 1 reading and math programs. All of the schools offer ESL services to their LEP students. State compensatory education (SCE) funds are available in all of the district's elementary schools. In schools that have both Chapter 1 and SCE, staff are typically partially funded by both programs. SCE funds also provide math services to some eighth graders.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The state's definition of LEP indicates that a student, as declared by a parent or guardian, first learned a language other than English, comes from a home where the language usually spoken is other than English, or usually speaks a language other than English, and further that the pupil's score is significantly below the average district score for pupil's of the same age on a nationally normed English reading or language arts achievement test. A pupil's score shall be considered significantly below the average district score for pupils of the same age if it is one-third of a standard deviation below that average score.

In selecting LEP students for Chapter 1, the state's policy indicates that Chapter 1 programs must assume that LEP students already have sufficient oral English-language skills to

benefit from the services provided in English and with materials in English. In addition, LEP students must meet all of the existing requirements for Chapter 1 service, and it must be determined that Chapter 1 can meet the assessed needs of a particular LEP student.

Local Policies and Procedures for LEP Student Identification. The state definition of LEP is not used in the district. District personnel were not aware that the state defined LEP as being from a non-English background and below grade level on a standardized reading or language arts achievement test.

Students are identified for ESL services based on one of several assessment measures: IPT, BSM, Carrow, or LAB. An ESL teacher usually administers several of these tests in order to determine a student's English language proficiency. Parent and teacher input also come into play in determining if a student will receive ESL services.

Students test out of ESL based on scores on the same tests that are used for LEP identification, although some teachers use the Maculaitis as an exit test. Students typically stay in ESL for two years, although older students may take longer than two years in acquiring sufficient language to exit ESL.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Chapter 1 selection is based on CAT test scores. Students scoring below the 40th percentile are eligible and are served unless the classroom teacher feels they do not require Chapter 1 assistance. For selecting first graders for Chapter 1, a district-developed test is used since the CAT test is not administered to kindergartners.

LEP students may be eligible for Chapter 1 reading or math after they have acquired an established level of English language skill as measured by the tests used to determine English-language proficiency. The Chapter 1 and ESL staff worked together to establish English-language proficiency levels for students in each grade that must be attained prior to assessment for Chapter 1 services. Once LEP students reach the prescribed level of language proficiency they are assessed for Chapter 1 using the CAT.

The district policy on serving LEP students in Chapter 1 indicates that student need must be caused by educational deprivation, not language deficiency. The district suggests that

information on the student's educational needs be gathered from ESL teachers, classroom teachers, family members, and educational records in order to determine if a LEP student is educationally disadvantaged. However, several Chapter 1 teachers indicated that teacher judgment was seldom used in Chapter 1 selection.

The Chapter 1 Program

The Chapter 1 program served 440 elementary school students in 1988-89. Chapter 1 offers reading and math remediation to students in grades 1 through 4 with services provided either in a pull-out or in-class setting. In Chapter 1 schools, staff are joint funded by Chapter 1 and SCE. The SCE program requires that services be provided within the classroom, and SCE teachers may serve any student.

Programs for LEP Students

The ESL program in this district is a pull-out program. Grade K students typically receive 20 minutes of ESL two to five days per week depending on individual need. Older students typically get 30 minutes or more of ESL for two to five days, depending on need. Because there are not enough LEP students in most schools to warrant a full-time teacher, teachers travel from school to school.

The district is considering altering this program design and placing LEP students in an orientation center. If implemented, teachers would not have to travel, and students could get more intensive ESL services.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

LEP students receive the same Chapter 1 services as English-proficient students. More LEP students are served through the Chapter 1 reading program than through the math program, but this is also true for English-proficient students.

Chapter 1 teachers feel that they have not altered their instructional methods to accommodate LEP students. At the same time, several of the Chapter 1 teachers felt that serving younger LEP students in Chapter 1 was easier than serving the older students because the differences in reading level and language comprehension among older students are greater.

It appears that once they meet the language criteria, most LEP students who score below the 40th percentile on the CAT receive Chapter 1 reading services without consideration of the source of educational need, be it language or educational deprivation. In the three schools visited, 14 of 37 LEP students in grades 1 through 4 were served in the Chapter 1 program. Many of those not served in Chapter 1 are from an international background, are associated with the university and typically do not require Chapter 1.

When asked about their ability to distinguish between needs stemming from language proficiency and educational deprivation, several teachers felt that they could distinguish based on the rate at which students acquired English-language skills. Those LEP students who were very slow in learning English, compared to other LEP students with similar backgrounds, were thought to be educationally deprived as well as language deficient.

DISTRICT D2

Introduction

This urban district has a large population of Southeast Asian students who make up 18.5 percent of the enrollment. There is also a sizeable Hispanic population in the district. Many of the Hispanic families are or were migrant agricultural workers. In a district of about 22,000 elementary school students, 3,672 (about 17 percent) are identified as LEP, and 11,138 (51 percent) are qualified for free or reduced-price lunch. In each of the past several years, the district has enrolled about 500 new LEP students (excluding kindergarten). Of these new students, 85 percent are Southeast Asian, and 80 percent have been in the U.S. less than six months.

In 1975, the district signed a consent decree, setting up guidelines for specific instructional services to Hispanic LEP students. In addition, there are three Title VII projects in the district. One is specifically designed to serve handicapped LEP students. The Title VII projects typically provide bilingual instructional assistants.

Six schools in the district are designated as centers for teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). These schools are for newly arrived LEP students with little or no English language skills. Students receive intensive ESL instruction in an all-day replacement program.

There are 42 public elementary schools in the district, some of which are magnet schools. Twenty-two of the public elementary schools have Chapter 1 programs and schools that do not have Chapter 1 programs have state compensatory education programs which closely parallel Chapter 1. Thirty-six of the elementary schools have programs for LEP students, either TESOL replacement or ESL pull-out programs. Two elementary schools in the district offer neither Chapter 1 nor services for LEP students.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The state definition of LEP indicates that a student, as declared by a parent or guardian, first learned a language other than English, comes from a home where the language usually spoken is other than English, or usually speaks a language other than English, and further that the pupil's score is significantly below the average district score for pupil's of the same age on a nationally normed English reading or language arts achievement test. A pupil's score shall be considered significantly below the average district score for pupils of the same age if it is one-third of a standard deviation below that average score.

In selecting LEP students for Chapter 1, state policy indicates that Chapter 1 programs must assume that LEP students already have sufficient oral English language skills to benefit from the services provided in English and with materials in English. In addition, LEP students must meet all of the existing requirements for Chapter 1 service and it must be determined that Chapter 1 can meet the assessed needs of a particular LEP student.

Local Policies and Procedures for LEP Student Identification. The district is well aware of the state definition of LEP and uses it. In addition, the district supplements the standardized achievement test information with information from the IPT test in determining English language proficiency and related language needs.

Potential LEP students are assessed for eligibility at the TESOL assessment office. If a student has a home language other than English, has IPT scores below the acceptable standard for grade level, or has a standardized reading or language arts test score more than one-third of a standard deviation below the district mean for that age, the student is identified as LEP.

Students who are non-English speaking typically attend a TESOL center for one to two years. TESOL centers do not serve grade K, so these students are mainstreamed in a regular classroom. Kindergarten students may be pulled out for up to half of the school day for ESL instruction. At the end of kindergarten, the TESOL center assesses the LEP students to determine if they would be better served in the TESOL center or by remaining in the regular classroom.

The transition from a TESOL classroom to a regular classroom occurs when the LEP students in grades 1-2 achieve 80 percent or more of the K-6 learner outcomes in levels I and II established by the district. Students in grades 3-6 must achieve 80 percent of the learner outcomes in levels I, II, III, and IV.

LEP students in the regular classroom receive ESL services until they have mastered 80 percent of the learner outcomes in the appropriate level for their grade, have reading or language scores on the SRA above one third of a standard deviation below the mean for their grade, and it is determined that the student no longer requires ESL services.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Student selection for Chapter 1 is based on teacher judgment and SRA test scores. Eligibility for Chapter 1 in grades 2-6 is determined by scores on the reading and math portions of the SRA. Students falling below the 40th percentile are eligible for service, with students below the 30th percentile in composite scores determined to be in greatest need of service and therefore given priority.

To inform teacher judgment, teachers administer a district-developed Chapter 1 reading and math placement test. Following the test, teachers rank student need from zero to five separately for reading and math, with five reflecting greatest need for remediation. While there is a matrix to guide teachers in translating level of mastery to the corresponding ranking of need, teachers may alter the ranking by plus or minus one point based on performance in the previous school year. Students with a combined teacher assessment score in math and reading of over five and an SRA composite score below the 30th percentile typically are served in Chapter 1. Personnel in some schools indicated that the teacher assessment scale was initially used to place students and when SRA scores arrived in the beginning of November, Chapter 1 lists were adjusted.

SRA scores are not available for students in grades K and 1. For Chapter 1 selection in kindergarten, the Test for Ready Steps is used to screen students. In grade 1 reading and math, the regular classroom teacher indicates the learner outcomes that have been mastered by the students as outlined on a district-developed list.

LEP students must attain a basic level of English-language proficiency to be eligible for Chapter 1 services. The eligibility for Chapter 1 for LEP students is based on IPT test levels

and grade and these test levels are also used to determine whether a LEP student is placed in a TESOL center or in a mainstream classroom. To be assessed and served in Chapter 1, LEP students in grades 1-6 must attain level C on the IPT. (For grade K, level B must be reached.)

Once students have sufficient English-language proficiency to be placed in a regular classroom with ESL support, they are eligible for Chapter 1 services and are assessed for those services in the same way as English-proficient students.

The Chapter 1 Program

The Chapter 1 program offers reading and math instruction to students in grades K-6. Services are offered in pull-outs, computer labs, extended-day, and in-class settings. Even within a school, several settings may be used. For example, one school offers in-class math but pulls students out for reading assistance. Service delivery models often vary by grade. Extended-day programs are typically used for kindergarten students.

Intensity of services can also vary. In most pull-out programs, students receive small group instruction from Chapter 1 for 20-50 minutes, two to five days per week.

The Chapter 1 reading and math teachers follow the same curriculum as the regular class.

Programs for LEP Students

The six TESOL centers offer whole-day replacement programs for LEP students in grades 1-12. These centers were established in 1975-76. LEP students with very limited English language skills are assigned to one of 14 self-contained TESOL classrooms for intensive ESL instruction. TESOL classrooms may have a wide range of ages (6-13). The main focus of a TESOL classroom is learning oral English and basic survival skills, but strong emphasis is also placed on teaching basic reading, writing, and math skills.

Once students are placed in a regular class, they are typically pulled out for ESL instruction. The ESL curriculum for LEP students is based on a district-developed set of learner outcomes and the Addison Wesley ESL series. The learner outcomes include vocabulary, listening comprehension, descriptive words, grammar and structure, articulation, and oral expression sections. Levels of difficulty on the learner outcomes are related to age and grade level. The intensity of ESL services is supposed to be tied to English language proficiency level and grade, but students are typically pulled out for ESL for 30 minutes per day. Students with very little English may be pulled out twice a day if scheduling permits. LEP kindergarten students may be served in class rather than pulled out. Elementary school students typically remain in ESL for two to three years.

There are also some bilingual teacher aides who work in the regular classroom. These aides are funded by Title VII grants or consent decree funds. However, the primary LEP program remains an ESL pull-out.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

About 75 percent of the students receiving ESL are also receiving Chapter 1 reading. Scheduling appears to be the greatest determinant of type and intensity of service. Students who are getting both Chapter 1 reading and ESL may be pulled out for both programs. Schools have a great deal of autonomy in designing and scheduling services. For example, in one school, students in both programs receive ESL and Chapter 1 reading programs in alternative weeks, one pull-out one week and the other pull-out the following week.

Chapter 1 teachers feel they have had to alter their instruction slightly to accommodate LEP students. They also feel LEP students should have some functional English language skills before being placed in Chapter 1.

DISTRICT E1

Introduction

This small city district was one of the first in the country to start an English as a Second Language (ESL) program. It was designed 24 years ago to serve Arabic-speaking students whose families moved into the area to work in local shoe factories.

Minority students now compose 35 percent of the student body. The largest group is Hispanic and has moved in recently, primarily from Puerto Rico.

The school district consists of 15 elementary schools (grades K-5), four middle schools (grades 6-8), and two high schools (grades 9-12). There are about 15,000 students in these 21 schools with an elementary enrollment of almost 8,000. About 42 percent of the elementary students come from low-income families, based on free or reduced-price lunch eligibility. The town is characterized by persistent poverty -- primarily because a number of major businesses moved out 15 or 20 years ago and were never replaced. Workers who once earned $15.00 an hour now may make only $5.50 an hour doing light industrial work.

All of the district's schools were eligible for Chapter 1 in 1989-90. The free and reduced-price lunch figures ranged from 8 percent in the most affluent school to over 75 percent in the district's poorest areas. ESL services are provided to eligible students in 11 of the 15 elementary schools as well as in all four middle schools and both high schools.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA's policy for identifying Chapter 1 students states that students scoring at or below the 40th percentile on standardized tests in reading and math are eligible. Twenty different tests for assessing Chapter 1 eligibility are recommended. Districts may choose from those recommended or may choose another test but must then justify their test selection.

The only provision made by the SEA for assessing LEP students is a requirement that there be programs at the local level addressing English language proficiency. All specific policies and procedures for LEP education are established at the district level. The SEA does not provide funding for LEP programs but monitors testing procedures through one state-wide bilingual consultant.

No efforts are made at the SEA level to coordinate services to LEP students or to assure that LEP students are served by the Chapter 1 program when appropriate.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. Preliminary identification of LEP students is done either at the time of registration or upon the recommendation of a classroom teacher. A home language survey is completed by parents or school secretaries. The open-ended form requests home language, reason for referral, and other comments. This district maintains an extensive, district testing program for referral into its ESL program. Two full-time evaluators in the ESL office carry out all testing following preliminary identification -- they are notified by the school office as soon as a new non-English speaking student is registered. There are six tests used in student identification and selection:

- language Assessment Survey;
- bilingual Syntax Measure;
- test of Awareness of Language Segments;
- secondary Level English Proficiency test;
- the Language Assessment Battery test; and
- the Spanish Assessment for Basic Education.

Based on results from these tests, students are ranked from Level I (no response in English) to Level IV (English proficient). These results are then used to rank students' need for ESL services. In addition, the results become the foundation of an elaborate cumulative record folder that is maintained for each student at the district and ESL classroom levels. The folder includes documentation of the students' skills over the course of their academic career. All test results, work samples, teachers' progress reports, and other information considered relevant to a student's progress is included.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Students are selected for Chapter 1 based on standardized tests and/or staff referrals. Referrals may come from teachers, guidance counselors, or psychologists. The Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) is given each spring to all students in second grade and above and students scoring in the 49th percentile or below are eligible for Chapter 1 services. Houghton Mifflin's Independent Reading Inventory is also used for student identification.

The regular Chapter 1 program is seen as an option only for students who are fluent in English. Although the district encourages all students who have any English at all to take the MAT, the ESL supervisor and the evaluation specialists "do our best to protect as many of our kids as we can from having to take it because it is bad for their self-esteem." Although the district does not have a policy prohibiting LEP students from taking the MAT, classroom and ESL teachers decide whether particular students should be tested or not.

The Chapter 1 Program

Pre-kindergarten, reading, mathematics, and ESL were the primary subjects offered by Chapter 1 in 1989-90, although mathematics will probably be eliminated in the 1990-91 school year. Chapter 1 provides reading services to elementary students in grades K to 3 and provides mathematics instruction to students in grade 2-3.

Teachers and aides provide Chapter 1 services, with each school deciding how and where each will be used. Typically, aides work with grade K students, while certified teachers and aides work with students in grades 1-3.

The formulae of hours and staff both for Chapter 1 and ESL are so complex that some of the aides and even some teachers do not know what pot of money is paying their salaries. The ESL Supervisor, for example, is funded by Chapter 1 and the district; she reports to the Chapter 1 coordinator for the Chapter 1 ESL program and to an assistant superintendent for the local ESL program.

Students in Chapter 1 ESL receive instruction for a minimum of 45 minutes each day. Services are typically provided in groups of 10 students per instructional aide in a pull-out setting. District-funded ESL is offered in all grades, but Chapter 1 ESL is offered only in the elementary schools.

Students in Chapter 1 reading and mathematics receive assistance for a minimum of 90 minutes per week. Services are typically provided in an in-class setting, although pull-outs may also be used. The pupil-staff ratio for Chapter 1 instruction is 10 to 1 for each group session.

Programs for LEP Students

The primary objective of the district's ESL program is "to successfully place all students in the district's regular program as soon as possible to the ultimate advantage of the student." In addition, there are a variety of other academic and cultural objectives to the program. Emphasis is placed on teaching LEP students the basic skills that are fundamental to all learning, as well as those specific to an LEP student's survival in the regular classroom. The emphasis on these broader skills, attitudes, and habits is intended to help prepare students for a cultural environment broader than the schoolroom, according to the ESL supervisor. Discussion about philosophy and goals permeates any conversation about the program at the district level.

Although the teachers and aides that serve LEP students are bilingual, they typically use simplified English when working with LEP students, using the students' primary language only when absolutely necessary. These teachers and aides also may translate sections of English language textbooks when needed.

Approximately 750 LEP students in the district's schools are served by the ESL program, which is funded by Chapter 1 and local monies. The instructional staff of the ESL program consists of teachers who are funded by Chapter 1 funds, aides who are funded partially by Chapter 1 and partially by ESL, and some aides who are funded solely by local funds.

Guidelines for when and where LEP students will receive ESL instruction can vary from school to school throughout the district. ESL is administered as both an in-class and a pull-out depending on grade level and level of need. Individual schools decide if and to whom which

version of the program will be offered. These differences are minor and, overall, policies are relatively consistent throughout the district. ESL teachers and ESL aides have separate and distinct duties. ESL aides are employed in all the ESL designated schools and in schools which receive students who have been mainstreamed but which do not actually house programs. All aides work with small groups of children in learning activities prescribed by the ESL or classroom teacher.

ESL aides provide tutoring and small-group practice under the supervision of an ESL teacher. LEP students who are pulled out for ESL instruction still participate in the regular classroom in art, physical education, music, library, home economics, and industrial arts.

Within the ESL program, student progress is monitored often by teachers (directly) and by administrators (indirectly). Tests are used during and at the end of each year to accomplish this. Student profile sheets that are essentially incremental checklists of performance, are updated and kept in the students' record folder. Graphs are used in these profile sheets so that they can be evaluated at a glance. The Houghton Mifflin reading series has been adopted in the elementary schools. Teachers can assess students' English reading ability using the Houghton Mifflin language survey and placement tests. As a student gains in reading ability, he/she is placed into an ESL reading group based on mastery scores of the basal series word recognition (or word meaning) and comprehension sub-tests.

At the end of each academic year, all LEP students are tested by the district evaluator and a program plan for the following year is considered. As students acquire more English-language skills, they are gradually mainstreamed into additional areas. These judgments are mainly made by the ESL teachers in conference with the principal and other teachers. In the end, however, a testing procedure similar to the entry procedure is used to determine a student's eligibility to exit the program. Based on the same series of tests, and including consideration of student performance, an English proficiency rating of III or better is usually sufficient to allow a student to exit. Level III is not automatically sufficient, as level IV is, but must draw on other factors, such as maturity and self-confidence.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

The impression is one of a hodgepodge of funding that the ESL supervisor is blending to create a very strong Hispanic influence in the elementary schools. A recent Chapter 1 audit turned up several exceptions but the supervisor says that she is unconcerned about compliance issues and that the mingling of funds is necessary to produce a strong program.

It appears that the ESL program is one that nurtures Hispanic culture; one classroom teacher felt that it maintains the students too long in a Spanish culture and delays their entrance into the wider society. An ESL teacher reported that children were reluctant to exit the program, and came back to their ESL rooms frequently for help and support.

The strongest part of the program appears to be the testing and evaluation component along with curriculum guides and objectives for every grade level (or proficiency level) of the program.

DISTRICT E2

Introduction

This small city school district has about 13,000 students enrolled in 15 elementary schools (K-5), four middle schools (6-8), and two high schools (9-12). Eighteen percent of the student body is of Hispanic origin and there are small percentages of other language groups represented, including Arabic, German, Vietnamese and other Asian languages, Portugese, and Italian.

About 23 percent of the students are reported to be from low-income families, with 28 percent of students at the elementary level eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA's policy for identifying Chapter 1 students states that students scoring at or below the 40th percentile on standardized tests in reading and math are eligible. Twenty different tests for assessing Chapter 1 eligibility are recommended. Districts may choose from those recommended or may choose another test, but must then justify their test selection. The districts are informed that Chapter 1 must serve LEP students based on educational deprivation, not language deficiency.

In terms of identifying LEP students, the SEA requires that local-level programs address students' language deficiencies. The SEA does not provide ESL funding, but monitors the efforts through one state-wide bilingual consultant. All specific policies and procedures for LEP programs are established at the district level.

There is little or no coordination at the state level between Chapter 1 and programs for LEP students.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. Identification and assessment of LEP students is centralized in one resource and enrollment center. The center's

primary function is to assure that all LEP students are placed in the most appropriate educational program to develop their academic and English language skills.

Students are initially identified as LEP based on a preliminary language screening administered at registration and a home-language survey. Potential LEP students are then sent to the resource and enrollment center for testing.

The major test to determine English-language proficiency is the IPT (IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test). The IPT-1 is used for grades 1-5, IPT-2 for grades 6-12. The Woodcock Reading Test is also used to assess reading and writing skills in Spanish and in English. As a result of these tests, students are rated on their levels of English language proficiency. Level I is a non-English speaker; level II is a limited English speaker; level III is an English speaker, but may be considered LEP if low in English reading and high in Spanish mastery.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Chapter 1 students are identified based on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) reading comprehension and math computation subtests. The district uses the 40th percentile as a cutoff point in determining Chapter 1 eligibility. In addition, based on teacher judgment, up to 5 percent of students scoring above the 40th percentile may be served in Chapter 1.

Identification of LEP students for Chapter 1 services is done, whenever possible (i.e., primarily for those at level III), using the MAT. Students who can take the MAT are eligible for Chapter 1 based on the same 40th percentile cutoff as their English-proficient peers. Some Spanish-speaking LEP students at levels I and II are identified for Chapter 1 based on the SABE, also using a 40th percentile cutoff.

The Chapter 1 Program

A total of 1,943 public school children in grades K-8 were served by Chapter 1. Of these, 1,233 were in grades K-5. Chapter 1 provides reading, math, and ESL instruction. Reading and math services are offered in pull-out, in-class, or high intensity computer lab settings. ESL services are typically provided in a pull-out or in-class model. Chapter 1 also provides guidance services.

Use of the computer labs in Chapter 1 is part of a High Intensity Learning System (HILS) which takes place in four elementary schools and two middle schools. The HILS labs utilize a systemic approach to reading and mathematics instruction which allows students access to a vast amount of material and enables teachers to manage large groups at a fast pace. Nevertheless, each instruction-prescription is individualized and tailored to the student's needs. The focus of the HILS program also changes from grade to grade where different goals are sought. Students in the HILS lab program receive services and are scheduled for a minimum of three times per week, 30 minutes each session. Fifteen students typically attend the lab in a given session.

Chapter 1 ESL services are provided to students who are enrolled in the district's ESL program based on teacher referral, using district-designed forms on student competencies. ESL aides work with students in small group sessions for 30-45 minutes. The ESL aides are bilingual and are capable of providing native language support when necessary to clarify instruction and help students complete assignments made by the regular classroom teacher.

Programs for LEP Students

In total, 938 LEP students are served in some phase of the program for LEP students. Of these, 750 students are in elementary grades. All of these services are district-funded in whole or in part.

Services for LEP students are concentrated in grades K-8 and serve students at three levels of need. Level I students are non-English speakers; level II students are limited English speakers; and level III students are English speakers still in need of ESL and support services. The students are served according to their level of need, but across the board, there is a distinction between services for Spanish-speaking LEP students and LEP students from other language backgrounds.

For Spanish-speaking LEP students, there is a full bilingual program, beginning at grade K. Level I students are in primary language instruction classes that are all-day, self-contained replacements with instruction in Spanish and ESL. Level II Spanish speaking students

are placed in a transitional program. Teachers use sheltered English with a greater focus on ESL instruction. For both levels I and II, the district has allocated specific schools to house the self-contained bilingual classes for particular grades. All the self-contained bilingual grade K-2 classes are in one elementary school, all the grades 3-5 are in another, and all of the self-contained bilingual grades 6 to 8 classes are in one middle school. Level III students are mainstreamed but receive ESL pull-out services.

For other language groups, there are no separate bilingual classes for students in levels I or II. These students are all mainstreamed and receive tutoring and/or ESL pull-out services.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

Level I and level II LEP students who have been identified as below the 40th percentile in reading on the SABE or MAT may receive services from Chapter 1 funded ESL aides. LEP students in level III may receive Chapter 1 reading and math services, or in some schools they may receive Chapter 1 ESL services. Level III LEP students in grades 3-5 also may receive services in the computer lab along with their English-proficient peers. Some level III LEP students may get both Chapter 1 reading and Chapter 1 ESL services.

The district has been able to implement its Chapter 1 and programs for LEP students in a relatively coordinated way -- with both separate and overlapping components. Chapter 1 funds some of the ESL instructional activities, and half of the Bilingual Program Coordinator's salary. Some aides that provide ESL services and Chapter 1 reading instruction are joint funded by district bilingual and Chapter 1 programs. The relatively small and manageable size of the district contributes to the ease of coordination.

DISTRICT F1

Introduction

This is a large, urban school district which serves as a point of entry for new immigrants, particularly those arriving from Southeast Asia. For the district as a whole, the LEP enrollment increased 19 percent from December 1988 to December 1989. The total K-5 enrollment is 17,296. This district has students speaking approximately 50 different languages in their public schools.

Twenty-one of the 64 elementary schools have special programs for the over 1,600 LEP students.

As part of a desegregation plan, the district has implemented what it calls controlled choice. Schools are divided into clusters based on geographical location. At least one of the schools in the cluster will have an ESL program. Parents may choose to send their child to any one of the schools within their cluster; however, a parent of LEP children has the option of choosing a school that does not offer ESL. As a result, all of the schools in the district have some LEP students, but LEP students are predominantly located in the schools with special language programs.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA is well aware of the difficulties in serving LEP students in Chapter 1. SEA personnel stress with their districts that LEP students should be eligible for Chapter 1 if they are educationally deprived as well as English-language deficient. The bilingual and Chapter 1 offices are housed together and meet on occasion to coordinate the programs.

The SEA requires districts to use the LAS, BSM, or BINL to identify LEP students, but other tests may be used with approval of the SEA. The SEA also requires that LEP students be identified within 20 days of initial school attendance. According to state regulation, districts

must make available to each identified LEP students a transitional bilingual education program or, if the use of two languages is not practical, an alternative instructional program. By regulation, students are entitled to a transitional bilingual or alternative instructional program for three years or until they score above the 35th percentile on the reading and language arts portions of a nationally normed standardized test.

Local Policies and Procedures on LEP Student Identification. The district opened a centralized intake center and bilingual orientation centers for new students to deal with a large influx of Southeast Asians and other immigrants. The central intake center serves as a gateway for placement of LEP students. Parents are interviewed regarding family history as well as their children's educational history. Educational records are translated, credits are compiled, and LAS tests are administered to determine levels of English-language proficiency. The centralized intake center also provides translators for IEP meetings, court proceedings, etc., and collects and compiles data on the various language groups represented in the district.

The LAS, supplemented by the California Achievement Test (CAT), is used to determine the student's level of English-language proficiency. The tests are usually administered at a central intake center. Students are sorted into six groups based on the results of the tests, years in the TBE program, and other characteristics as follows:

1. low initial LAS score; less than 3 years in TBE program;
2. low CAT score; 3-5 years in TBE program;
3. exited from TBE, no longer eligible;
4. high initial LAS score, not eligible for TBE;
5. low CAT scores; 5 or more years in TBE program; and
9. not eligible for TBE due to handicapping condition.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. Students are judged eligible for Chapter 1 if their CAT scores are below the 25th percentile in reading or math. For students in the pool of eligibles, teacher judgment is used to decide which are most in need of services and will be served.

Regular classroom teachers also decide whether a LEP student takes the CAT test. The district's view is that for the score to be valid, and therefore qualify a student for Chapter 1, a composite math or reading score must be obtained. Even if a student does not have a CAT score (i.e., they did not take the test, could not complete sufficient segments, or are new in the district) or is not in the lowest quartile on the CAT the student can still be selected for Chapter 1 based on classroom teacher referral. If the teacher thinks the student needs extra help, the student is referred to the Chapter 1 teacher who will assess the student's needs based on one of the following tests:

Math	
Grade 1	Metropolitan Achievement Test
Grades 2-5	Stanford Achievement Test
Reading	
Grades 1-5	Ginn
Grades 1-5	Informal Reading Inventory

Following this assessment, the Chapter 1 teacher and the regular classroom teacher make a determination about the student's Chapter 1 eligibility.

The district policy regarding Chapter 1 services to LEP students states that students may not receive special instruction in the same subject from two different programs. District policy states that LEP students are eligible for Chapter 1 services if they meet one of the following conditions:

- are in category three or four on the LEP scale;
- are enrolled in a school that does not have a bilingual education program (automatically eligible for Chapter 1);
- are in category two or five if they are recommended by the classroom teacher and bilingual education teacher and not receiving reading or math through TBE; or
- are in category one and are on trial exit from TBE.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 serves students in grades 1-5, with slightly more first and second graders represented. Chapter 1 served 3,526 in 1989-1990. The students served by Chapter 1 were predominantly black (42%) with whites composing the second largest racial group (27%).

Chapter 1 is supplemented by a state compensatory education (SCE) program. The district's neediest schools receive Chapter 1 funds and all remaining elementary schools have parallel programs funded by SCE.

Chapter 1/SCE instruction in the district includes math, reading, and language arts. Schools may decide whether to use a pull-out or in-class setting. Some bilingual instructional aides are employed to help LEP students during their Chapter 1 math pull-out sessions.

Programs for LEP Students

Bilingual orientation centers enroll immigrant children in grades K-12 who have little or no English language skills. The centers include an intense ESL component as well as cultural orientation to new students to provide these students with language survival skills. Instructional aides provide primary language support. Students typically stay at the orientation center for one to two semesters before being enrolled in a regular neighborhood cluster school.

Once in the regular class, LEP students may receive ESL instruction for between 30 minutes and 3 hours per day, depending on their level of need. While some bilingual aides are available to assist in the student's primary language, no formal bilingual instruction is provided. Students exit from the LEP program when they score in the 35th percentile or higher on the language arts composite CAT.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

LEP student participation in Chapter 1 seems to vary to some extent based on the school, and the Chapter 1 and LEP program service delivery patterns in each school. One school

that was visited adopted a basic skills block in which students are assigned to two teachers per day, one basic skills teacher for math, reading, and language arts, and the other for social studies, science, health, etc. There is one basic skills block class for ESL students, and two for Chapter 1 students, but students of all backgrounds and abilities are combined for the non-basic skills portion of the day. This model precludes students from receiving both Chapter 1 and ESL services.

In two other visited schools, students in the newcomer center could receive Chapter 1 math services but not Chapter 1 reading. School staff indicated that students could not receive instruction in the same subject from two different sources (e.g., Chapter 1 reading and locally funded ESL). If LEP students were on trial exit (i.e., placed in an all-English class with no additional support) they were eligible for Chapter 1 reading and math.

Teachers reported that LEP students were more likely to receive Chapter 1 math than Chapter 1 reading. Some bilingual aides and teachers were available to assist when LEP students were included in Chapter 1 math programs.

School-level Chapter 1 staff complain that Chapter 1 dollars are distributed among eligible schools based on CAT test scores. LEP students who do not take the CAT test but receive Chapter 1 services do not generate funds like English-proficient Chapter 1 students.

DISTRICT F2

Introduction

This district is in a small city located several hours from the nearest large urban center. The economic base of this small city is primarily agricultural.

Of the 6,741 elementary school students in the district, 3,402 receive free or reduced-price lunch and 1,007 are LEP. The LEP population in the district is composed primarily of Spanish-speaking migrant farmworkers who come to the valley from Texas each spring for the harvest and return to Texas in the fall.

Twelve of the 13 elementary schools in the district enroll formally identified LEP students; nine of them have programs for LEP students funded by Title VII or State transitional bilingual education (TBE) funds. Six elementary schools have Chapter 1 programs, and the remaining 7 have State Compensatory Education (SCE) programs. The Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program (MEP) also plays a large role in serving LEP students in the district.

LEP and Chapter 1 Identification and Assessment Policies and Procedures

State Policies and Procedures. The SEA is well aware of the difficulties in serving LEP students in Chapter 1. SEA personnel stress with their districts that LEP students should be eligible for Chapter 1 if they are educationally deprived as well as English-language deficient. The bilingual and Chapter 1 offices are housed together and meet on occasion to discuss coordination of the programs.

The SEA requires that districts use the LAS, BSM, or BINL to identify LEP students, but other tests may be used with approval of the SEA. The SEA also requires that LEP students be identified within 20 days of initial school attendance. According to state regulation, districts must make available to each identified LEP students a transitional bilingual education program or, if the use of two languages is not practical, an alternative instructional program. Students are entitled to a transitional bilingual or alternative instructional program for three years or until they

score above the 35th percentile on the reading and language arts portions of a nationally normed standardized test.

Local Policies and Procedures for LEP Student Identification. Students are identified as LEP based on the Moreno or the LAS. The LAS is administered initially to determine whether a student is LEP. If students score at level one or two on the LAS, they are then given the Moreno to place them in the appropriate language services. Some first graders take the Spanish Brigance instead of the LAS. Students are retested every fall using the Moreno to reassess their English-language proficiency.

The Moreno is administered by paraprofessionals. Since it is tied into the reading curriculum, it places students at a particular lesson. Based on the results of the Moreno, students are divided into three groups, those who require TBE in all subjects, those who are ready for some English-language instruction, and those who are ready to function in an all-English classroom with some primary language support.

The district is developing a criterion-referenced test that will measure both oral and written language skills.

Local Policies and Procedures for Chapter 1 Student Selection. For first-grade Chapter 1 student selection, the Brigance readiness test (in English or Spanish, as appropriate) is administered for students who have been recommended by their regular classroom teacher. In grades 2-5, a composite score combining several different selection criteria is used for Chapter 1 and MEP student selection. These criteria include: book reading level, regular classroom teacher rating of need, score on a district-developed criterion-referenced test, remedial teacher's rating of need, and ESL level. These variables are entered into a weighted formula to arrive at a composite ranking of student need for each Chapter 1/MEP subject. For students in grades 6-12, scores on the Gates-Maginitie test is used for Chapter 1 student selection.

Elementary students are disproportionately selected for Chapter 1 reading according to grade, as follows:

1st grade	20%
2nd grade	30%
3rd grade	20%
4th grade	15%
5th grade	15%

Elementary students are selected for Chapter 1 math based on the following grade representations:

2nd grade	40%
3rd grade	30%
4th grade	20%
5th grade	10%

Students who are in a bilingual classroom and are below grade level in Spanish reading skills receive Spanish-reading remediation in a pull-out setting from MEP. Once students are ready to transition from Spanish to English, they may receive ESL services through MEP along with English reading services from Chapter 1.

The Spanish Woodcock is used to measure need for Spanish reading assistance and the English Woodcock is used to assess the need for ESL. The combination of data from these tests, in addition to teacher judgments, is used to determine the student's dominant language.

The Chapter 1 Program

Chapter 1 has several components including math and reading which may be offered in an in-class or pull-out setting, and a home-based pre-kindergarten program. In the home-based, pre-kindergarten program, district staff work with students and parents to improve pre-reading and pre-math skills, demonstrate the importance of reading in the home, and model effective parenting skills.

Chapter 1 reading serves students in grades 1-12, while math services are provided in grades 2-8. SCE provides similar services in less economically needy schools. Chapter 1 and SCE services are provided by certified teachers and paraprofessionals.

Programs for LEP Students

The TBE program serves students in grades PK-12. ESL is one component of instruction in a bilingual classroom that includes either a bilingual teacher or a bilingual aide. Bilingual classrooms also include some native English speakers. If bilingual classes become too full, incoming students may be bused to other schools for bilingual services.

Specific requirements for students to transition out of the TBE program into an all-English classroom are:

- student begins reading in English;
- student continues reading in Spanish until reading in English is at grade level;
- student begins to write in English;
- student meets district learning objectives using a combination of English and Spanish textbooks; and
- student continues oral language development.

However, language-minority students are not considered English-proficient until they are performing at grade level in English; they do not need services from Chapter 1 in reading, math, or language arts; and they do not require paraprofessional assistance.

The provision of Spanish reading remediation through MEP is controversial within the district. However, the bilingual education administrator is extremely aggressive in promoting bilingual education services.

According to district and school-level personnel, the system of service delivery works fairly well for Spanish-speaking LEP students. At the same time, several teachers and administrators admitted that the provision of services to LEP students from other language

backgrounds was based on individual circumstance rather than a consistent system. One Polish student had recently moved into the district, for example, and then the district located and hired a part-time aide who spoke Polish to work with the student.

Chapter 1 Services to LEP Students

LEP students may be eligible for Chapter 1 reading if they are transitioning to English, and they are eligible for Chapter 1 math at any point in their language development. Because of the stringent exit criteria for LEP students, Chapter 1 serves a large number of LEP students who are considered to be in transition. According to district personnel, students should not receive Spanish-reading remediation from MEP and English-reading remediation from Chapter 1 at the same time.

In many cases, the students from language backgrounds other than Spanish and English have done quite well academically and have not required either Chapter 1 remediation or special LEP services. However, provisions for assessing the compensatory education needs of non-Spanish speaking LEP students do not seem to be in place.

While one staff person who is jointly funded by Chapter 1 and bilingual education helps coordinate services to LEP students, there appears to be more of an effort to coordinate MEP and bilingual than Chapter 1 basic and bilingual. The bilingual education program is part of the basic curriculum while Chapter 1 basic and MEP are housed in the federal programs office. At the teacher level, coordination is primarily informal.

APPENDIX B

CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX B

	Page
SEA Chapter 1 Administrator Questionnaire	B-5
SEA LEP Administrator Questionnaire	B-7
District Documentation Checklist	B-9
District Characteristics	B-10
LEA Chapter 1 Administrator Questionnaire	B-11
LEA Administrator Questionnaire	B-13
LEA LEP Administrator Questionnaire	B-15
School Documentation Checklist	B-17
School Characteristics	B-18
Principal Questionnaire	B-19
School Chapter 1 Administrator Questionnaire	B-21
School LEP Administrator Questionnaire	B-23
Chapter 1 Teacher	B-25
LEP Teacher	B-27
Classroom Teacher	B-29
Counselor	B-31

STATE _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SEA CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe any State policies regarding the provision of Chapter 1 services to LEP students.

2. Please describe any state policies regarding how LEP students are selected for Chapter 1. (How does the state define LEP? Is the definition used throughout the state? What criteria are used? Are specific tests recommended? Are there differences by grade? Are teacher judgments used?) Are these policies required? recommended? suggested? Or are these decisions left entirely up to the LEA?

3. Please describe the types of assistance the state provides to LEAs in designing Chapter 1 programs for LEP students.

4. When reviewing Chapter 1 district applications, to what extent is specific attention paid to provisions for LEP students? What specific components do you review?

STATE _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SEA LEP ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe any State policies regarding how elementary level LEP students are identified. (How does the state define LEP? Is the definition used throughout the state? What criteria are used? Are specific tests recommended? Are there differences by grade? Are teacher judgments used?) Are there state requirements for services to LEP students? How are these requirements met?

2. In general terms, what are the main types of elementary school programs in this state for LEP students?

   A. What are the sources of funding for each program?

   B. About how many districts receive each type of funding or have each type of program?

   C. How many districts are there in the state overall?

Program	Funding Source	# of Districts
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Total # of districts: _____

3. What is the organizational relationship between offices administering Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 programs for LEP students? (Are they both part of a federal program division? Are they in separate divisions? What?)

Organizational Chart

STATE _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SEA-LEP ADMINISTRATOR

4. Please describe any state policies regarding the provision of Chapter 1 services to LEP students.

5. To what extent are services for LEP students and Chapter 1 coordinated at the state level? (What coordination activities are held? How often are these held? Who attends?)

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

DISTRICT DOCUMENTATION CHECKLIST

Documents to be obtained where appropriate:
(check those obtained)

- Chapter 1 State Application ____
- Written policies regarding Chapter 1 selection ____
- Written policies regarding LEP identification ____
- Most recent Chapter 1 Evaluation Report ____
- Most recent district-wide needs assessment ____
- District policies regarding multiple categorical programs ____
- Other ____

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

District: School and Student Data

- Total number of public elementary (K-6) students (Districtwide) _____
  - Number of free/reduced price lunch students _____

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
• Number formally identified LEP students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
• Number Chapter 1 students	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

- Total number of public elementary schools _____
  - Number with Chapter 1 programs _____
  - Number with programs for LEP students _____
- Number of public elementary schools with formally identified students _____
  - Number of these schools with Chapter 1 _____
  - Number of these schools with LEP programs _____
  - Number of these schools with both Chapter 1 and LEP programs _____
  - Number of these schools with neither Chapter 1 nor LEP programs _____

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEA CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe your district's policies regarding identification and selection of students for Chapter 1 (K-6). (Is that policy used throughout the district? What procedures do you recommend? What criteria are recommended? Are specific tests used? Are there differences by grade? Are teacher judgments used?) How do these policies relate to any state policies on identification and selection of students for Chapter 1?

2. What subjects does the district offer as part of the Chapter 1 program?

   List all Chapter 1 subjects offered

   Describe how your district decides which Chapter 1 subjects to offer. What procedures do you use for assessing the needs of English-proficient students? What procedures for LEP Students?

3. In addition to Chapter 1, what other programs are provided that address some of those same student needs, for example, state compensatory education, local remedial/compensatory programs, bilingual/ESL, migrant education? How do you decide which programs are used in particular schools and who is involved in the decision? (Does this vary by grade?)

4. How does your district identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria?

5. What is your district's policy about serving LEP students in Chapter 1? Do you have any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

6. What is your district's policy about how to select LEP students for Chapter 1? (How do you address problems of testing? How do you use teacher judgment?) Are the procedures for selecting LEP students the same as those for selecting English proficient students? If not, how do they differ? (Grade, school, language groups?)

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEA CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATOR

7. About how much staff time is associated with selecting a typical LEP student for Chapter 1? About how much staff time is needed for assessing his/her compensatory education needs? (Would you provide an estimate for each step?) How does this compare to the staff time for selecting English proficient students? How does the time for assessing needs compare?

8. How do you recommend that people in the schools decide which LEP students receive one Chapter 1 subject rather than another, for example, Chapter 1 ESL, Chapter 1 reading, Chapter 1 bilingual, other Chapter 1? How does this differ from English-proficient students?

9. What are some of the ways that you have had to modify Chapter 1 reading (or math) to meet the needs of LEP students? (Setting, staff ratio, staff qualifications, duration, etc.)

10. How successful do you think Chapter 1 is in helping meet the language needs of LEP students? Which Chapter 1 subjects seem to help the most? What criteria are you using in judging the success of the program? (Would you please provide us with evaluations and documentation?)

11. What are the Chapter 1 objectives, generally speaking, for LEP students? (How differ for non-LEP?) To what extent are Chapter 1 objectives being met for LEP students? To the extent that they are being met, what services is Chapter 1 providing for LEP students, compared to English-proficient students, in order to meet Chapter 1 reading and mathematics objectives?

12. What is the organizational relationship between the office that administers Chapter 1 and the office that administers non-Chapter 1 programs for LEP students at the district level?

Organizational Chart

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEA ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe your district's policies regarding identification and selection of students for Chapter 1 in grades K-6. (Is that policy used throughout the district? What procedures do you recommend? What criteria are used? Are specific tests recommended? Are teacher judgments used? Are there differences by grade?)

2. Describe how your district decides which Chapter 1 programs to offer? (How does the district use the results of needs assessments?)

3. Please describe your district's policies regarding how LEP students are identified. (How does your district define LEP? Is that definition used throughout the district? What criteria are used? Are specific tests recommended? Are teacher judgments used? Are there differences by grade? By school? By language group?) Is a student's English-language proficiency reassessed using these same procedures or different procedures? How often is it assessed?

4. What is your district's policy about the number of categorical programs students can participate in at any one time?

   Does the policy apply to LEP students?

   Does the policy vary by grade level?

   IF THERE IS NO POLICY, are there informal guidelines for placement of students? If so, please describe.

5. What is your district's policy about how to select LEP students for Chapter 1? (How do you address problems of testing? Do you use teacher judgment?) Are the procedures for selecting LEP students the same as those for selecting English proficient students? If not, how do they differ? (Grade school, language group?)

6. In general terms, what are the sources of funding for the elementary school programs (K-6) in this district for LEP students (Bilingual? ESL? MEP?) (Program and Funding Sources)

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEA ADMINISTRATOR

7. How does your district determine which LEP students participate in which programs? IF "BY SCHOOL" or "BY GRADE," Why are some programs in some schools (grades) but not others? Are you involved in many of these decisions? Who else is involved?

DISTRICT _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEA LEP ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe your district's policies regarding how LEP students are identified. (How does your district define LEP? Is that definition used throughout the district? What criteria are used? Are there differences by grade? Are specific tests used? Are teacher judgments used?) How often are LEP students reassessed? What procedures are used?

2. Do you know how children are identified and selected for Chapter 1? What is that? Is the process any different for English-proficient or LEP students? How so?

3. What is your district's policy about the number of categorical programs students can participate in at any one time?

   Does the policy apply to LEP students?

   Does the policy vary by grade level?

   IF THERE IS NO POLICY, Are there informal guidelines for placement of students? If so, please describe.

4. What are the sources of funding for the elementary school programs in this district for LEP students? (Program and Funding Sources)

5. How do you determine which LEP students participate in which programs? If "BY SCHOOL" (or "BY GRADE"), why are some programs in some schools (grades) but not others? Are you involved in many of these decisions? Who else is involved?

6. What happens to LEP students in schools with Chapter 1 programs and one or more special programs for LEP students? Are they assessed for Chapter 1? Are they served in the Chapter 1 program? Does Chapter 1 teach or test differently for them compared to English-proficient students?

DISTRICT _____
SCHOOL _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SCHOOL

Documents to be obtained where appropriate:
(check those obtained)

- written policies regarding Chapter 1 selection (including LEP) ____
- written policies regarding LEP identification ____
- descriptions of programs offered ____
- other (specify) ____

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SCHOOL

SUMMARY SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS
(from Principal or Other Source)

- Chapter 1 yes no

  List all Chapter 1 subjects offered

- Non-Chapter 1 LEP yes no

  List all non-Chapter 1 programs for LEP students

- Current enrollment

Grade	Total Number Enrolled	Number of Enrolled Who Have Been Formally Identified as LEP	Number of Total Enrolled in Chapter 1 Programs	Number of Total Enrolled in Non-Chapter 1 LEP Programs
K				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				

- List those languages other than English that students speak as their native language and the approximate number of students per language (Language and Number of Students)

- Number of free/reduced price lunch students _____

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

PRINCIPAL

1. Please describe your school's procedures regarding identification and selection of students for Chapter 1 instructional services (K-6). Who is involved in selecting Chapter 1 participants? (District procedures? Criteria? Differences by grade? Specific tests? Teacher judgments?)

2. About how much staff time is associated with selecting each student for Chapter 1? About how much staff time is involved with assessing his/her compensatory education needs? (Would you provide an estimate for each step?)

3. How many Chapter 1 students do you have? How many more of your students are eligible for Chapter 1 but are not served?

4. Describe the different Chapter 1 subjects offered at this school. (Subject, Number of Students, and Grades)

   How did you decide to offer these subjects as opposed to other Chapter 1 subjects? (Grades, needs assessment results, district policy, etc.)

5. In addition to Chapter 1, what other programs are provided that address needs of students for compensatory education, remedial work, English-language assistance, for example, state compensatory education, local remedial/compensatory programs, bilingual/ESL, migrant education? How do you decide which of those programs is offered and who is involved in the decision? (Does this vary by grade?)

6. How does your school identify LEP students, including policies, definitions, and specific criteria?

7. How many formally identified LEP students are in the school? How many more are having trouble with school because of English language problems who do not qualify as LEP students under the identification procedures you use?

8. What is your school's policy about serving LEP students in Chapter 1? Do you have any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

DISTRICT _____
SCHOOL _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

PRINCIPAL

9. Please describe the procedures used to select LEP students for Chapter 1? Who is involved? How do you address problems of testing? How do you use teacher judgment?

10. What is your role in deciding what programs will be available in your school for LEP students?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SCHOOL CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe your school's procedures regarding identification and selection of students for Chapter 1. Who is involved in selecting Chapter 1 participants? (What procedures does the district recommend? What criteria are recommended? Are cut-offs used? Are ranking methods used? Are there differences by grade? Are specific tests used? Are teacher judgments used? What tests are used for evaluation of student gains?)

2. A. How much staff time is associated with each step of selecting a student for Chapter 1? How much staff time is associated with assessing his/her specific compensatory education needs?

   B. How does the staff time for each of those steps compare for selecting and assessing LEP students for Chapter 1?

Steps (From Question 1)	Staff Time	
Selection	A. Any Student	B. LEP Student
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Assessment		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. How many Chapter 1 students do you have in this school? How many more students are eligible for Chapter 1 but are not served?

4. Describe the different Chapter 1 subjects offered at this school. (Subject, Number of Students, and Grades)

   How did you decide to offer those subjects as opposed to other Chapter 1 subjects?

5. How does your school formally identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SCHOOL CHAPTER 1 ADMINISTRATOR

6. What is the school's policy about serving LEP students in Chapter 1? Are there any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time? (Vary by grade?)

7. Please describe the procedures used to identify and select LEP students for Chapter 1? Who is involved? What achievement measures are used? Are English-language proficiency tests used? Do you use English-language or native-language testing? Are there differences by grade? By language group? What is the role of teacher judgment? Do you use a ranking system?

8. What are some of the ways that you have had to modify Chapter 1 program to meet the needs of LEP students? (Class size, instructor ratios, instruction qualifications, setting, duration, etc.)

9. What instructional or other services is Chapter 1 providing for LEP students, compared to English-proficient students, in order to meet Chapter 1 reading and mathematics objectives?

10. How successful do you think Chapter 1 is in helping meet the language needs of LEP students? Which services seem to help the most?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

SCHOOL LEP ADMINISTRATOR

1. Please describe the school's procedures regarding how LEP students are identified. (How does your school define LEP? Is that definition used throughout the district? What criteria are used? Are there differences by grade? Are specific tests used? Are teacher judgments used?) How often are LEP students reassessed? What procedures are used?

2. How are children identified and selected for Chapter 1? What is your role in that process? Is the process any different for English-proficient or LEP students? How so?

3. What is your school's policy about the number of categorical programs students can participate in at any one time? Does the policy apply to LEP students? Does the policy vary by grade level? IF THERE IS NO POLICY, are there informal guidelines for placement of students? If so, please describe.

4. How do you determine which LEP students participate in which special language-related services and other compensatory education programs? [IF "BY SCHOOL" or "BY GRADE," why are some programs in some schools (grades) but not others?] Are you involved in many of these decisions? Who else is involved?

5. What happens to LEP students in schools with Chapter 1 and one or more special-language programs for LEP students? Are they assessed for Chapter 1? Are they served in the Chapter 1 program? Does Chapter 1 teach or test differently for them compared to English-proficient students?

6. Do you and your teachers get involved with the Chapter 1 program when LEP students are in it? IF YES, could you tell me how that works? Do you or your teachers suggest materials or approaches? What else?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

CHAPTER 1 TEACHER

1. Please describe how you or people in your school identify and select students for Chapter 1. Who else is involved in selecting Chapter 1 participants? (What procedures does the district recommend? What criteria are recommended? Do you use cut-offs? Do you have ranking methods? Are there differences by grade? Are specific tests used? Are teacher judgments used?) What is your role in this process?

2. A. How much staff time is associated with each step of selecting a student for Chapter 1? How much staff time is associated with assessing his/her specific compensatory education needs?

   B. How does the staff time for each of those steps compare for selecting and assessing LEP students for Chapter 1?

Steps (From Question 1)	Staff Time	
Selection	A. Any Student	B. LEP Student
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Assessment		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. How does your school identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria? About what percentage of your Chapter 1 students are LEP?

4. What is the school's policy about serving LEP students in Chapter 1? Are there any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

CHAPTER 1 TEACHER

5. Please describe the procedures you or people in your school use to identify and select LEP students for Chapter 1? (What is your role? Who else is involved? What achievement measures are used? Are English-language proficiency tests used? Do you use English-language or native-language testing? Are there differences by grade? What is the role of teacher judgment? Do you use ranking systems?)

6. What are some of the ways that you have had to modify your Chapter 1 classes to meet the needs of LEP students?

DISTRICT _____
SCHOOL _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

LEP TEACHER

1. How does your school formally identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria? What is your role in this?

2. Describe the procedures used to identify and select LEP students for Chapter 1? (What is your role? Who is involved? What achievement measures are used? Are English-language proficiency tests used? Do you use English-language or native-language testing? Are there differences by grade? What is the role of teacher judgment? Do you use ranking systems?

3. How often do you reassess LEP students for English proficiency? What procedures do you use for reassessment?

4. Are there more students in this school who are having trouble with school because of English-language problems but who do not qualify as LEP students under the definition being used? How do you and the school help them?

5. Are there any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

CLASSROOM TEACHER

1. Please describe your role in identifying and selecting students for Chapter 1. What procedures do you use? What criteria are used? Are cut-offs used? Are ranking methods used? Are there differences by grade? Are specific tests used? Are teacher judgments used? What test(s) are used for evaluation?

2. How do people in your school formally identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria? What is your role in that?

3. Are there more students in your class who are having trouble with school because of English language problems but who do not qualify as LEP students under the definition being used? How do you and the school help them?

4. Are there any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

5. What is your role in deciding which special program or programs a child should be assigned to?

6. What are some of the ways that you have had to modify your classes to meet the needs of LEP students?

7. How do you coordinate efforts between you and the Chapter 1 and any other special (for example, language) teacher so the student has a consistent educational program?

DISTRICT _____ OMB NO.: 1875-0032
SCHOOL _____ FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

COUNSELOR

1. Please describe your role in identifying and selecting students for Chapter 1. (What procedures does the district recommend? What criteria are used? Are cut-offs used? Are ranking methods used? What specific tests are used? Are there differences by grade? Are teacher judgments used? What test(s) are used for evaluation?) Who else is involved in selecting Chapter 1 participants?

2. A. How much staff time is associated with each step of selecting a student for Chapter 1? How much staff time is associated with assessing his/her specific compensatory education needs?

   B. How does the staff time for each of those steps compare for selecting and assessing LEP students for Chapter 1?

Steps (From Question 1)	Staff Time	
Selection	A. Any Student	B. LEP Student
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Assessment		
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. About how many more students do you have in the school who are eligible for Chapter 1 but are not served?

4. In addition to Chapter 1, what other programs are provided in this school that address needs of students for compensatory education, remedial work, English-language assistance? (For example, state compensatory education, local remedial/compensatory programs, bilingual/ESL, MEP?) What is your role in deciding which of those programs are offered?

DISTRICT _____
SCHOOL _____

OMB NO.: 1875-0032
FORM EXPIRES: 12/31/90

COUNSELOR

5. How does your school identify LEP students, including: policies, definitions, and specific criteria? How are you involved in this process?

6. Are there more students in the school who are having trouble with school because of English-language problems but who do not qualify as LEP students under the definition being used? How do you and the school help them?

7. Are there any restrictions on how many categorical programs students can be in at any one time?

8. Please describe the procedures used to identify and select LEP students for Chapter 1? (Who is involved? What achievement measures are used? Are English-language proficiency tests used? Do you use English-language or native-language testing? What is the role of teacher judgment? Do you use ranking systems?)

9. How does your school decide on the total program a LEP student receives including any or all of the available Chapter 1 subjects, bilingual, or other services?

ED/OPP 92-4

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1992 0 - 317-759 : 60075